

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. VIII

OCTOBER, 1923

No. 4

EDITORIAL

WHAT SHALL THE PREACHER PREACH? IF CHRISTIANITY is really unique among the world's religions, then it is of the first importance for the preacher to learn what gives it its place. Its nineteen centuries of progress point to some vital and dynamic inner principle that has enabled it to survive falling civilizations and to supersede other religions. Its central teachings, as given in its sacred writings, must reveal this.

But the one dominant aim of the Scriptures is to reveal man's sinful condition and the plan for his redemption from it. It follows that the preacher's great theme is man's redemption. The greatest minds of many generations of Christian preachers have found in this an exhaustless fountain; soul winners have ever found here their most resistless appeal. Even in this day one usually goes to church to find the answer to his inner questionings as to God's demands upon him. But preaching seems to be cultivating the art of pleasant intellectual persuasiveness rather than the power of spiritual and moral authority.

It is true that men need much teaching and council bearing on their social relationships and their individual well-being, but a quickened soul is an awakened

social force. Are we to emphasize chiefly the great underlying principles of Christianity, or simply its social corollaries?

In response to a request for his own views in this matter, Dr. Macartney has replied in a vigorous paper upon *The Preacher* and the "Grand Particularities." He makes it clear at the outset that he recognizes the fact that we have many strong preachers to-day; indeed, he thinks that the general average was never so high. But he misses the note of authority, and stresses chiefly this fact. Considering modern preaching broadly, he finds its failure in a decline of faith, so that much preaching is "sincere but not earnest." He holds that the great themes of divine revelations are the source of authoritative preaching, and he deals chiefly with these—the fact of divine revelation, the fact of sin, the fact of redemption, and the future life. It is not a controversial article, but it is a most earnest call to preach the main things, to cultivate faith, and to restore the note of authority.

IN WRITING UPON PAUL'S PLACE IN THE CHRISTIAN Revelation, Rev. William E. Scofield rejects the idea that Paul was accorded his place because of his standing as an apostle, his wonderful and fruitful activity, and his powers of intellect. This attitude toward these outstanding characteristics in this remarkable career might leave the reader wondering how Paul's influence is to be explained if these things are excluded. But he is not long left in doubt, for Mr. Scofield first proceeds to answer the question thus raised and then to support the answer.

He finds in Paul's account of his salvation, as that of "the chief of sinners," the key to Paul, for he regards

this descriptive phrase as no mere rhetorical gesture. Paul so regarded himself, and declared that through his salvation the long-suffering of Christ was shown. "Paul's place in the New Testament is due to his personal experiences of divine grace."

It is then pointed out that, wonderful as the Gospels are, as they reveal Christ's earthly life, atoning death, and resurrection, and striking as are the disclosures of divine power in The Acts, the Christian message would be inadequate did it lack a concrete revelation of what Christ does for men through the ministry of the Spirit. It is necessary to know what Christ does in the individual soul. Some one must reveal the profound meaning of Christ's presence in a redeemed soul, and Paul gives us this revelation, thus completing the record of Christ's redemptive work. Paul's experience was ideal in its revelation, in both range and intensity, and, being unique in its comprehensiveness, enabled him to become in a peculiar sense our guide in understanding the deep things of God. The nature of the revelation received by Paul is taken up, three of its various aspects being considered, the Kingdom of God, the Lordship of Christ, and the Ministry of the Spirit.

We are reached and taught, quickened and strengthened by the marvelous richness of a life thus actually lived, as we could not be simply by the presentation of Christianity as a body of great truth, as yet not vindicated by a living example of its power. The truth as it is revealed in Christ is demonstrated with overwhelming power in Paul.

UNBELIEF IS SUSCEPTIBLE OF ANALYSIS, LIKE OTHER mental attitudes and states. In his treatment of it,

Mr. Wyckoff distinguishes between "acute" and "chronic" unbelief. In the April issue of this quarterly his discussion of Acute Unbelief attracted unusual attention because of its bearing upon the religious problem in our universities and colleges. No less important is his present paper upon Chronic Unbelief. Indeed, the two are very closely related. If, as he has said, "chronic unbelief is constitutional; acute unbelief is institutional," the constitutional unbelief of the teacher may largely account for the institutional unbelief manifest in the students.

Mr. Wyckoff first considers the psychological genesis of chronic unbelief and the identifying marks of the chronic unbeliever. Then he proceeds to consider several prominent cases of the kind, all of them writers of note—H. G. Wells, Professor Leuba, and the melancholy Nietzsche. Incidentally he discloses the interesting fact that he is in possession of the original data upon which Professor Leuba based his thesis, *Religious Conversion*, but which have since been placed in Mr. Wyckoff's hands for treatment because Professor Leuba's interpretation was unsatisfactory.

The most striking fact about the three cases cited is the great influence of early antagonism to religious environment upon the whole after life. In fact, it would almost seem that the chronic unbelief of mature years, bolstered up by all the arts of rationalism, is often no more than the prolongation of a childish rebellion against hated authority.

There is also formed upon the reader's mind the impression that deep in the consciousness of every such chronic unbeliever there persists the knowledge that he is kicking against the pricks—that the struggle is really futile, but that the cumulative stubbornness of years

will not permit him to open his heart to the truth. The hopelessness of the unbeliever's task is that it occupies minds, designed for positive, constructive response to truth, with nothing but a presumptuous and vain attempt to destroy the ultimate foundations.

IT IS NOT SURPRISING THAT THE SAME CRITIC SHOULD deal with both painting and poetry. These arts, and music, are instruments expressive of the soul's profoundest emotions and experiences. Mr. Wright has from time to time given in these pages noteworthy papers upon painters and painting, but in the present number he devotes himself to one of the great poems of modern times, *The Hound of Heaven*, by Francis Thompson. This ode appeared a generation ago, but seems to be more highly appreciated to-day than ever.

The career of Thompson was the tragedy of a most unfortunate nervous constitution. Morbidly reserved and sensitive, he was doomed to a life devoid of normal association with his fellows.

The present paper is one of the chapters from the manuscript of a book upon Thompson and his work, wherein a biographical sketch precedes this analysis. It is not shown that the poet ever fell into gross dissipation, but there was a period of groveling wretchedness, apparently the result of his despairing nature. In this singularly striking poem the writer seems to have depicted his own attempt to escape from God.

Mr. Wright deals somewhat with the general character of Thompson's literary work, as well as with this poem. After speaking of its strange title, *The Hound of Heaven*, he treats it by divisions made for his own critical purpose, whether they coincide with those of the poet or not.

In both title and ode there is an almost lawless originality and ruggedness, yet somehow in peculiar harmony with the desperate adventure of a soul seeking refuge from God in His own universe. The imagination, richness of diction, and structural peculiarities displayed remind one of Edgar Allan Poe; indeed, there seems a kinship between the two poetic temperaments.

But unusual, even startling, as is this word picture, it is a sublime acknowledgment of the infinite reach and patience of divine Love in its pursuit of the sinner.

IT HAS BEEN POINTED OUT THAT, ALTHOUGH THE severe restrictions of the old regime prevented Russian writers from formally discussing the wrongs of their country, they found an even more effective way of denouncing them. They developed their powers of description until they pictured the lives of the common people under the tyranny of the Czars with appalling vividness. The facts were set down, without comment or interpretation, and through the reaction in the minds of men the mine was laid for the vast upheaval. In this lies a suggestion that need not be elaborated here.

In Dr. Horne's brief paper, *What Did the Cross Mean to Christ?* we have a somewhat similar method of presentation. He attempts nothing of a theological or critical nature, but seeks to mass in brief compass, with very limited comments, given experiences and utterances of our Lord, that the reader may receive a new and deep impression of history's central event and a truer grasp of its significance.

Incidentally this paper is an interesting example of the efforts of men not in the ministry to spread the vital truths of the Gospel. Indeed there seems to be aris-

ing, informally and unheralded, an order of teaching laymen urged by the spiritual indifference of the times to draw men to their Lord.

INTEREST IN LATIN-AMERICA IS GROWING. THIS DOES not refer to commercial matters alone, but to all the great departments of life. Recent political tendencies there promise to develop among us a very real concern with respect to our sister republics on that continent. Bolshevism or communism seems to be gaining a decidedly strong foothold from the Rio Grande south, and disquieting news of the extent to which it has seized the popular mind is heard with increasing frequency. Changes of importance may be impending.

Modern political radicalism is so hostile to Christianity that it can hardly be expected to flourish among peoples that are deeply religious. What, then, is the religious situation in South America? Professor Victor Andres Belaunde, of Peru, who as a political exile has been connected with Williams College of late, has been asked to answer this question, which he does under the head, *The Alienation of the Latin-American Mind from Christianity*.

Those who read Dr. MacKay's paper, *Religious Currents in the Intellectual Life of Peru*, in this quarterly for April, 1921, will recall the high tribute he paid to Professor Belaunde as one of those who "represent new tendencies in the intellectual life of Latin-America." Beginning with the difference in the attitudes of the men and the women toward Christianity, Professor Belaunde proceeds to a brief historical resumé of the religious life of South America. He shows the influence of Roman Catholicism, of successive schools of philosophy, and of new economic theories that are

spreading widely. One of the factors in the development of thought in South America, as he points out, is the tendency of the ardent Latin mind to go to extremes, hence the ease with which intense partisanship may develop. The latter part of this paper is most significant for us, because it foreshadows a marked advance of the radical political propaganda, "the great enemy of the Christian faith in Latin-America."

R. M. K.

THE PREACHER AND THE "GRAND PARTICULARITIES"

By CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, Pastor of the Arch Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia

THE arithmetic books which we used to study at school had the problems, or questions, printed in the front part of the book and the answers in the back of the book. Christian preaching once asked the great questions which vex the mind of man, and gave the great answers of the Christian revelation. The answers were given clearly, without apology, and with finality. To-day Christian preaching seems to raise a great many interesting questions about man's duty here and his destiny hereafter, but the answers are not given as once they were. There is deep earnestness in the Christian preaching of the day, but, outside of the Roman Catholic churches, the note of authority is hardly discernible. We hear much about the new knowledge, and "progressive" revelation, and the enlargement of the human understanding; but to the great questions of life, "Is there a God?" "Am I a soul?" "Is there a way of salvation?" "What must I do to be saved?" "Is there a Heaven and a hell?"—to these questions the answer is oftentimes equivocal and indistinct.

This does not mean that there is not still a great deal of able preaching. In spite of the talk of how there were "giants in the earth in those days," the general average of preaching is probably higher to-day than at any other time in the history of Christianity. Magnetic personalities who have the genius for address-

ing their fellow-men, especially upon the great themes of religion, will always command their hearing. Regardless of what they preach, or their communion, or whether they are orthodox or heterodox, these specially gifted men are sure of their congregations. The number of popular preachers to-day is probably greater than at any time in the history of Christian preaching. Yet the tone of authority has been dying out of preaching.

There is but one explanation of this passing of authority, and that explanation is a very alarming one. It is the decline of faith. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. You cannot get back the preaching of conviction and authority by a campaign of exhortation to preachers, or by a cold affirmation of dogmas which have ceased to grip the mind. "I believed, therefore have I spoken," said the Psalmist. The only source of great preaching is great conviction. The student of the religious conditions of our day must not permit himself to be misled by a few instances of men in some of our pulpits who are practically agnostics as to the great doctrines of the Christian religion. These men have their sway and their day. But even those who so devotedly wait upon their preaching are not deceived as to the kind of message to which they are listening. However much they may praise it, they know that, although this preaching may discuss with interest the great questions of life, it does not give any sure answer to those questions. It is a mere impressionism which leaves no deposit of truth. In the words of Dr. Forsyth, in his *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, "To be ready to accept any kind of message from a magnetic man is to lose the Gospel in mere impressionism. It is to sacrifice the moral in religion to the aesthetic, and it is fatal to the authority either of the pulpit

or the Gospel. The Church does not live by its preachers, but by its Word."

It is clear, then, that where we have a true and living faith we shall have strong, positive preaching. In the days of Peter and John and Paul there was no need of asking for the preaching of authority, for those first great heralds of the Christian evangel spoke out of the fullness of their hearts. What the preaching of to-day, therefore, needs is not a new accent, not new subject matter, but a revirescence of faith in that message which has been committed to the church. It is lack of faith that makes men keep silent about the mighty truths of the Christian revelation, or, when they do mention them, makes them speak without enthusiasm or eloquence.

There is a vast amount of preaching to-day which is sincere, but not earnest. In the Confessions of an Opium Eater, Thomas De Quincey describes the preacher to whom he listened as a boy in Manchester as "sincere, but not earnest." Sincere, but not earnest! How could a man be sincere, but not earnest? De Quincey did not manhandle words, but used them to express a very definite idea. What could be the idea that lay back of this distinction between a sincere preacher and an earnest one? Light was thrown on the subject by what he had said about this preacher starting from the low ground of such themes as the benefits of industry, the dangers of bad companions, the importance of setting a good example or the value of perseverance. More light shone on the matter when I read a little further and came upon this: "By mere accident I heard quoted a couplet which seemed to me sublime. It described a preacher such as sometimes arises in difficult times, or in fermenting times—a son of thunder that looks all

enemies in the face and volunteers a defiance even when it would have been easy to evade it. The lines were written by Richard Baxter. As a pulpit orator he was perhaps the Whitefield of the seventeenth century—the Leucononmos of Cowper. And thus it is that he describes the impassioned character of his own preaching—

“‘I preached as never sure to preach again’

“(Even that was telling; but then followed this thunder peal):

‘And as a dying man to dying men.’

“This couplet, which seemed to me equally for weight and for splendor like molten gold, laid bare another aspect of the Catholic Church; revealed it as a church militant and crusading.”

Putting these two paragraphs together, that about his preacher’s unimpassioned and desultory themes, and this about Richard Baxter, who described himself as one who preached as “a dying man to dying men,” I began to see what De Quincey meant when he said of this preacher, whom he loved and respected, that he was sincere, but not earnest. Much of the best preaching of our day is sincere, but not earnest. It is not earnest because it does not lay hold upon what Chalmers in his regal manner called the “grand particularities” of the Christian religion.

One of John Wesley’s friends advised him, in his days of unrest and uncertainty, to preach faith until he had it. There is sound sense in that advice. If some of our preachers to-day, when they begin to get a little perplexed about some doctrine of Christianity, instead of ignoring these truths, or telling people their own perplexities about them, would only declare them in all their Scriptural fullness, faith and conviction would

come back to them. Captivated with a new faith themselves, they would have power with others. I believe that troubled preachers who preach upon the grand and peculiar themes of the Christian revelation will sooner or later arrive at enthusiastic faith themselves, and then their preaching will be with authority and not as the scribes and the Pharisees. Let me now speak of some of those great truths which no preacher can ignore if he is to create the impression which the voice of authority alone produces.

I. THE FACT THAT MAN HAS A REVELATION FROM GOD

In his book, *Belief in God*, the first of what promises to be a notable series, Dr. Charles Gore, formerly Bishop of Oxford, says: "This, then, is the question: Has the Divine Mind or Spirit, whom we discern by the light of reason, hidden in the world—hidden in that its nature and character are involved in such obscurity—has it—or has He, taken action, like a person, on His side to disclose or reveal Himself to those who are seeking after God 'if haply they may feel after Him and find Him?' " This is indeed the great question of all religion, and the destiny of a race hangs upon the answer to that question. Despite its earnestness and scholarship, there can be little question that much of our present day preaching has created doubt as to whether or not God has revealed Himself and His will unto man. Therefore it is that our preachers must first satisfy themselves, and then their hearers, that God has actually spoken to man. As the author of the sublime prologue to the Epistle to the Hebrews phrased it, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in

times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."

The minister who deals with this fundamental proposition of religion, Has God given us a revelation of Himself? finds that he is compelled to deal with the Bible. A revelation from God without any record of it would be of no use to the world. The next question, therefore, is this: Is the Bible a trustworthy record of the revelation which God has made to man? The Westminster Confession states the whole matter with its usual dignity of language and lucidity of definition when it says: "It pleased the Lord at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal Himself, and to declare His will unto His church; and afterwards for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing; which maketh the Holy Scriptures to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing His will unto His people being now ceased."

The hearing and the reading of many sermons by the preachers of to-day would not give the impression that the Holy Scriptures are "most necessary." Many preachers seem to be able to get along without the Bible at all. In the case of some the Bible is not even taken for granted as the background of their discussions. If preaching has lost in its authority, undoubtedly we are getting at the root of the matter when we say that preaching has become extra-Scriptural. Sometimes it is positively anti-Scriptural. But the more common offense is the cool way in which preachers ignore the one charter of the religion which they proclaim. We shall never have that old authority of preaching which once

rang out in our churches until we get back our faith in the Bible. In dealing with the Bible we must not center our thought too much upon solitary and difficult passages or statements, especially such as here and there confront us on the pages of the Old Testament, but must keep in mind the great claim that the Bible makes for itself, namely, that it is the true record of God's revelation to man. More and more in my own ministry I have come to take strength and comfort in the ever-growing conviction, that in the Bible we have God's great word for man. I frankly confess that there are some things in the Bible which perplex me. But with increasing joy I see that there can be no reasonable account of the Bible save its own account, namely, that the Bible is God's word for man. Not human nature and human aspirations and human experiences are the preacher's charter, but man's nature and man's duty as they are set forth in the Bible.

In a recent article on the ten greatest books, H. G. Wells says of the Koran: "It has been a creative and cohesive power in the world second only to the Bible. Its power lies in its simplicity of assertion and in what it denies and repudiates." Beyond all books the Bible has this power of assertion and this power of denial. Therefore the preaching which is based upon the Bible has power and has authority.

In California last summer I worshiped on a Sabbath morning in a beautiful church. The service was rich and dignified; the music was Heavenly; and the sermon, although well delivered and conceived, was an address on the greatness of man, which any pagan might have delivered as well as this Christian minister. In the evening I chanced to pass a Gospel mission in the poorer section of the city. A few humble folk were

gathered together and with them men who had come in from the street. The preacher was illiterate, but earnest. His message was the same message that Peter and John and Paul preached, the true, peculiar message of Christianity, the remission of sins through the death of Jesus Christ. He said little else, yet the great thing was spoken. Repeatedly he held up his Bible before the congregation and pointed to this or that verse as the ground and proof of what he had been saying. Here was the preaching with authority. Some sinner might have been convicted by it and some wanderer brought home. But by no widest stretch of the imagination could one think of the eloquent essay of the grand church on the avenue convicting a soul of sin or starting the prodigal on that blessed journey which ends in the Father's arms and at the Father's house.

A preacher without faith in the Bible, or who does not make it the ground of his preaching and teaching, is as useless in the warfare with sin as a soldier who uses a blank cartridge. And, aside from the doctrinal significance, what a territory for the intellect, for the imagination, for the conscience! "Sight, riches, healing of the mind" are all there in the Bible. Joseph Parker, whose People's Bible is a great window into the Bible, used to be credited with sitting for hours in his study, tapping an open Bible with his finger tips and murmuring: "This is history—exhausts all history! This is poetry—exhausts all poetry! This is truth—exhausts all truth!" Thomas á Kempis said that the Bible is the one book whose wealth rebukes us more the older we grow because we knew and loved it so late. It is sad, but true, that many preachers are well along in their ministerial race before they awake to the power and beauty of the Bible.

On a summer trip to the Pacific Coast I broke the journey on a Saturday night at Fargo, North Dakota. I worshiped the next morning in a Baptist Church, the other churches, as usual in hot weather, being closed. After the service, as I walked through the town—and let me say I have great sympathy for the man who comes to a strange city to spend Sunday—I saw a beautiful structure which bore the name of the Norwegian Lutheran Church. I slipped into a seat at the rear of the long nave, and heard just the concluding part of the sermon. The closing hymn was sung to the music of Luther's great hymn, *A Mighty Fortress is our God*. But the words of the hymn were these:

God's Word is our great heritage,
And shall be ours forever.
To spread its light from age to age
Shall be our chief endeavor.
Through life it guides our way,
In death it is our stay.
Lord, grant while worlds endure,
We keep its teachings pure
Throughout all generations.

As those words went up upon the wings of Luther's grand music, I said to myself, "Yes, that is all that the church has, all that the preacher has—God's Word. That is our great heritage; that is all that man has to guide him in life and stay him in death; and to spread that Word throughout the world unto all generations is all that Christ has given His church to do in this world."

II. THE FACT OF SIN

The Bible is very clear and dogmatic on this matter of sin. The whole plan of salvation, as we have it in Christianity, assumes that man is a lost sinner. Yet the pul-

pit proclamation of sin has become fainter and fainter. Sometimes I feel that the present congregational and pastoral system is partly responsible for the subsidence of the doctrine of sin, for the pastor addressing the same people week after week, and speaking to many who are his intimate friends, and whose sorrows and temptations and burdens he knows so well, has a natural tendency to become a comforter and cheerer of his people, and finds it hard to name their sins and rebuke them for sinning. But, whatever the cause, the mighty Christian proclamation of human guilt has become fainter and fainter.

In a recent issue of a well known magazine there is an article entitled *The Confessions of a Church-Goer*. The writer says that he loves the church and having never learned to play golf, goes regularly to church, twice every Sabbath. I judge from what he says that his travels take him to many cities, and thus he enters many churches and hears many sermons. He says that when he has looked for bread upon which his better nature could feed, the pulpit has handed him the stone of "problems." "I have heard that word used until it gives me acute nausea. I have listened in vain for affirmations. The everlasting yea seems to have totally disappeared. Most of the sermons I have heard begin with the question-mark and end the same way. If my reading of the prophets is correct, they were men who presented solutions, and not problems alone. They seem to have had unlimited capacity for asseveration, without quibbles or reservations. My question to myself and to the Church resolves itself into an inquiry as to when this prophetic state of mind is going to be regained by those whom the Church picks as her spokesmen. Take the subject of sin; not theologically, but

practically. I have faults, lots of them. Call them sins, just for the sake of argument. I have shopped around in church after church, Sunday after Sunday, without hearing the matter mentioned. Yet it is one of the most important questions of my life—coupled with how to get rid of my faults. It would appear as though we in the pews no longer have sins worth talking about. We have mental complexes, distorted points of view, and all that sort of thing, but as for the Garden of Eden variety of sin, it seems to be as scarce among us as the dodo. Occasionally an evangelist appears amid clouds of sawdust trumpeting about the sins of the people in yellow journalese. They say some of the so-called Fundamentalists talk about sin, and that among certain other 'schools of thought' long since decadent it is an accepted subject. Perhaps it is, but it's a shame that such an expressive word should be confined to the vocabulary of controversy and not used in the field of practical living."

Who can deny that there is much ground for this indictment of the pulpit of the day? In spite of all that the evolutionary hypothesis may point to in the way of a physical development, the terrible facts of human life are all on the side of the Bible account of a fall, of a moral catastrophe which has wrecked man's nature, and they who deny it are simply biting on granite. The Law of God was given for the purpose of convicting men of sin. But how shall men be convicted of sin if the Law of God and the penalties of the broken Law are not declared unto men? No wonder that men will not have the cure when they do not know themselves as sick. We must bring Sinai back into Christian preaching, and Calvary, too, for the cross of Christ, so overwhelming an exhibition of the redeeming love of God, is also the

most awful exhibition of man's sin and of the penalty which sin merits. However men may pervert it and distort it and alter it, Christianity is a religion of redemption for sinners. It can have no interest, since it has no message, for a man who is not a sinner. The true Christian experience begins when the penitent prays, "God, be merciful to me a sinner."

III. THE FACT OF REDEMPTION THROUGH JESUS CHRIST

The popular preachers are telling us to-day that the great thing in Christianity is its law of development. The New Testament tells us that the great thing in Christianity is the mighty act of atonement and mediation performed by Jesus Christ upon the cross. "The love of Christ constraineth us," writes St. Paul, "for I thus judge that if Christ died for all, then were all dead." Christ offered Himself for us "once for all." That death of Christ was propitiatory, expiatory, reconciling. On the cross "guiltless blood for guilty man was shed." When the New Testament speaks of the love of God that is what it means—God's love redeeming us from the woe and curse of sin. There never was a day when preachers talked so much about the love of God and never a day when the word meant so little, or was so shallowly explained. In the Old Testament we are accustomed to magnificent passages which speak of the goodness of God as manifested in the world of creation, the sun, the sleepless sea, the stars, the grass, the flowers, the rocks, the birds of the air and beasts of the field, and in God's providential supply of all our needs. But that note is hardly ever struck in the New Testament. Why? Because these men had fixed their eyes on the cross of Christ. In the death of Jesus for

our sins they beheld the one grand exhibition of God's love, compared with which all else was but the feeble flicker of a candle.

Nature with open volume stands
To spread her Maker's praise abroad,
And every labor of His hands
Shows something worthy of a God.
But in the grace that rescued man
His brightest form of glory shines;
Here, on the Cross, 'tis fairest drawn
In precious blood and crimson lines.

When Paul speaks of the love of God, this is what he means: "God died for us." When John speaks of the love of God, that is what he means: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

To-day the greatest menace to Christianity is the apparent unwillingness of the pulpit to declare the love of God upon the terms of the New Testament. The Cross, preached in its purity, that Christ dies as my substitute, takes my place, bears my sins, drinks my cup, and that on the ground of His death and satisfaction God can forgive the sinner—this doctrine of the Cross is an offense to the mind and the heart of the natural man.

I preached last year in one of our leading denominational colleges. The subject was the conversion of Cornelius, how, although Cornelius was just, charitable, devout, beloved of man, Peter, in extraordinary ways, was sent to preach to him the Gospel of the remission of sins through Christ. The proposition was that, if in the whole earth there can be found a single man who does not need Christ, then the whole Christian structure collapses, for our Christianity offers itself as religion

of redemption from sin, and, since it offers itself to all, all must be sinners. The college paper the next day contained an editorial in which, along with some complimentary remarks, the writer said that it was a preposterous thing that in this day and generation a man should come to a college chapel and tell the men that a good moral man needs a Saviour as much as any other man. Why did the young man who wrote the editorial think that it was a strange thing for a preacher to say that? There can be only one explanation, and that is that the chapel preaching to which he was accustomed to listen—and I fear the young men of most of the colleges of the country—did not present in clear, uncompromising tones the great demands of the Gospel. The only authority that Christianity had when it established itself in that hard pagan world was the authority of the cross. There can be no preaching of authority with the “offense of the cross” left out.

IV. THE FUTURE LIFE—HELL AND HEAVEN

The great-organ stop in the mighty music of Christian theology is life to come. It was so in the preaching of Jesus Christ. As He speaks to us His eye wanders far from time into eternity. He seems to be standing under the cope of the next world and speaking to men in view of all the solemnities of that world. One of the popular complaints against the church has been that it is too much interested in Heaven, in the future life, and not enough in this present life; it is too “other-worldly” in its thinking. One could wish that there were some ground for this charge. Alas, how little ground there is for it! Never was there a time when Christian preaching was so saturated with the topics of the hour and the

earthly preoccupations of mankind. How few preachers pull out the grand stop of the future life! "For God's sake," cried Archbishop Leighton, "when all my brethren preach to the times, suffer one poor priest to preach about eternity."

There are undoubtedly many foolish sermons preached on the subject of Heaven. But that should not deter the earnest preacher from speaking on this high theme. We must all go hence. And whither? Is the minister to be silent on this subject? Is he to be an eloquent agnostic upon this great hope, as Robert Ingersoll was? Or shall he, with what materials are at hand, sketch Heavenly life? The Bible does not satisfy the curious, it does not map out the celestial country for us; but it does state the principles of the Heavenly life, and upon these let the preacher dwell. However men may seem to be above taking any interest in this subject, the fact is that all men are greatly interested in what comes at the "long last." Those dear reunions, the knitting-up of severed ties, the meeting of death-divided friends, the "social joys" of Heaven, the going from strength to strength, the possible service of ministry and redemption for other beings in other worlds, the magnificent powers of the redeemed soul and the resurrected body, and, best of all, the presence of the Lamb—all this offers to the preacher the highest ground upon which to stand.

But life to come has its shadowed side, and no faithful preacher of the Gospel will be silent as to that side. Future punishment, and apparently eternal punishment, is an inescapable teaching of the Christian religion. Both reason and revelation affirm it. The awful agony of Jesus in Gethsemane and on the cross, the very fact that God's eternal Son died for us on Calvary—all

this tells us that the state out of which Christ came to deliver sinners is one of darkness and woe. If there is no hell, no future punishment upon sin, then the death of the Son of God is too costly, too tremendous a remedy. The whole Christian revelation is reduced to a meaningless absurdity if its great presupposition, the lost and sinful estate of man, his sorrow and misery here and his misery and woe hereafter, is abandoned. As to future punishment, the issue as far as the Bible is concerned is this: Christ an infallible teacher, and the doctrine of future punishment; or, no future punishment, and Christ a fallible teacher.

"No one fears God nowadays," was the sigh of Dr. R. W. Dale shortly before he died. We preachers have spoken so much about the love of God without relating that love to His great provision for our redemption that our congregations would hardly know that God will punish sin. The almost total neglect to preach the fear of God has robbed Christian preaching of its power. Paul certainly understood the love of God, and he it was who wrote the beautiful lyric on Christian love. Yet he does not keep silence upon the future judgments of God. How many preachers in America during the past year have preached from such a text as this from Paul: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that everyone may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men"?

Ministers are sometimes exhorted to "preach as Jesus did." But what would these rationalistic critics have to say if ministers did preach more frequently as Jesus did? What if they should put into almost every prayer that they uttered and every sermon that they preached

and every counsel that they gave, a warning against future punishment? Let it be remembered that He whose lips were bathed in compassion, and in whose arms little children nestled, is the Preacher who said more than any other man about future punishment. Here, indeed, in the comparative silence of the modern pulpit on this subject, is the great contrast between the preaching of Jesus and that of many of His servants to-day. As Paul before Felix, so let the preachers of to-day reason with men of righteousness, of temperance, and *judgment to come*.

These, then, are what I mean by the "grand particularities" of the Christian faith. That God has revealed His will to man, that man is a lost sinner, that the only way to life eternal is through faith in Jesus Christ who died for our sins and rose again for our justification, that after death and the last judgment the righteous shall go away into everlasting life and the wicked into everlasting punishment—these are the tremendous affirmations of the Christian faith. Wherever these truths are not affirmed, the preaching, eloquent, popular, instructive, though it be, it can never be "with authority."

PAUL'S PLACE IN THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION

By REV. WILLIAM E. SCOFIELD, Pastor Methodist Episcopal Church, Sayville, Long Island, New York

THE QUESTION STATED

THE prominence that Paul's letters occupy in the New Testament continually thrusts before the mind a vital question. Why have they been given such a place? The question is not as to how the canon of the New Testament was established, and by what process these letters found their place in that canon. There is general agreement as to that. The question is one concerning the special value of Paul's letters in relation to the central theme of the New Testament; and this is quite another matter. With regard to this question there is not agreement. The answer we give to it will decide in large measure our attitude of mind as to Paul's spiritual authority, and likewise our view of the distinctive quality of the Christian faith.

There was nothing in Paul's position as apostle, or in his relation to the churches, which gave occasion in his day for regarding his words inspired above those of other apostles. We notice that only three of the twelve apostles wrote anything that finds a place in the New Testament. The other nine wrote nothing that was accepted by the church as inspired and authoritative. There was no primary reason why Paul should have been placed in authority above them. And yet his writings are more studied, and occupy a higher

place in Christian thought, than those of all the twelve apostles put together.

This could not have been because of his position in the church, for that was far from being one of undisputed pre-eminence. Peter and James were the leaders of the mother church at Jerusalem, and by that fact gained a certain authority over all the churches. There is no indication that this authority was anywhere challenged. On the other hand, Paul was constantly involved in dispute with those who bore the Christian name. His standing with the church at Jerusalem was dubious. The influence which that church exerted among other churches was usually hostile to his apostolic reputation. By that influence the churches of Galatia were led away from his teachings. Through the same influence the Corinthian church was divided into factions, and one party was created that denied Paul any standing as a Christian teacher; this in spite of the fact that the church at Corinth owed its very existence to his zealous labors. He lived and ministered in this atmosphere of opposition to the very end.

We can find no adequate ground for giving such prominence and authority to Paul's letters in the fact of his amazing zeal and activity. There were others in his day who were zealous for the spread of the faith—Barnabas, for instance. There is an epistle of Barnabas, which is accepted as genuine by the Greek Church, but it is not accounted a part of the Holy Scriptures. If zealous labor gave to Paul such authority as to place his writings among the canonical Scriptures, then we might expect additions at the present time. For men have been known in modern days who were quite as enthusiastic as Paul in Christian service. But the truth is that such activity does

not save a man from error, nor give him authority to reveal the mind of God.

The attempt to explain the position of Paul by considerations of his learning and intellectual gifts is wholly fruitless. They are in no sense a ground for the authority that the Christian church has accorded to him. It is granted that his mind was one of amazing activity. His reach of thought is so lofty as to make the average man gasp in very wonder. All this reveals the wisdom of God in selecting him as an inspired messenger, and shows also what quickening of mind may come through the Gospel of Christ; but these powers of intellect are not the proper credentials of his standing as a messenger of divine truth.

THE QUESTION ANSWERED

These reasons, then, for the position accorded to Paul we must reject, namely, his standing among the churches as an apostle, his activity as a Christian worker, and his intellectual gifts. If these be rejected, what other reason can be found adequate to explain his position?

The true reason is set before us in the first letter to Timothy. It is really the background of all his writings, but here it is declared with a vividness that makes it unforgettable. He speaks of his own salvation, and affirms it to have been the salvation of the chief of sinners. Surely we have no ground for thinking that Paul used hyperbole when he declared that he was the chief of sinners, or meant anything short of what the words express. He did not confess to sins of debauchery, of idolatry, of injustice or of cruelty. But he did confess the deeper and subtler sins of pride, unbelief, rebellion against God, and willful blindness to the

truth. When Paul looked back upon that dismal past he saw himself in reality the chief of sinners. He was a leader in active hostility to Christ. He could see no offenses more enormous than his own. That he should have been saved by Christ from a gulf of iniquity so deep was the daily wonder of his life.

Having declared himself to be the chief of sinners, he goes on to say that he was saved in order that the church might have a great revelation of the magnitude of Christ's mercy and of the outreach of His love. "For this cause," he says, "I obtained mercy, that in me as chief might Jesus Christ show forth all his long-suffering." The church up to the time of Paul's conversion had not known a like case. None had been saved from among the willful, strenuous opposers of Christ. But henceforth the church might expect the most glorious victories, since Saul of Tarsus, persecutor of the church, chief of sinners, had been brought in humble submission to the feet of the Master. The method by which he had been saved was extraordinary. The church needed to learn, not only the magnitude of Christ's long-suffering, but also the measureless abundance of His resources.

Here is the answer to the question we have raised: *Paul's place in the New Testament is due to his personal experiences of divine grace.* Those experiences were unique, and through them was made complete the Gospel message by which the church should conquer the world.

THE GOSPEL MESSAGE COMPLETED

There is a unity of the Holy Scriptures which we acknowledge when we call them "The Bible," and which is made possible by Jesus Christ. The unity of the

Old Testament is due to Him. The selection was made by men; by men, we doubt not, who were led by the Spirit of God, but nevertheless by men. What was the principle that governed the selection? There is only one that appears; it was relation to Christ. Every book of the Old Testament is somehow related to the Messianic hope of the Jews. Consciously or unconsciously, the norm which that hope established was applied in the selection of the Old Testament. Passing over to the New Testament we see still more clearly that the standard which guided the church in the selection of the books of the New Testament was Christ and His Gospel. It is their relation to the Gospel that gives authority to these letters of Paul. They are the permanent record of spiritual experiences through which the Gospel message became complete. They gave to the body of Christian truth the element which could not be secured through Christ's earthly ministry, nor through the general life of the church, but only through the ministry of the Holy Spirit unto the heart of the individual.

The message of Christianity is a message concerning Jesus Christ—the Christ whose story is told in the four Gospels. What a wonderful story it is! How beautiful is the picture of Jesus living His life among men, going about doing good, speaking unto men of Heavenly and eternal realities, breathing into their hearts the sense of God's love, rebuking sin and illuminating moral principles, dying in sacrifice upon the cross, coming forth in victory from the grave, and ascending at last in triumph into the heavens. This is the center of all our faith and hope. But if this were all that is revealed concerning Christ there would not

be an adequate message. The full meaning of the Gospel cannot be understood and proclaimed until the church knows what Christ does for men through the ministry of the Spirit. Further acquaintance with Christ is necessary beyond that which is gained through the four Gospel narratives.

The Spirit was poured out upon the disciples at Pentecost, and then was revealed that which Christ would do in and through the corporate body of the church. Those early days were filled with great disclosures. We must continually go back to them for basic principles. They hold for us a great ideal. That is the reason why the book of Acts is in the New Testament. We should not know Christ as we now know Him, if we had not this record. Now we know what the church has always the right to expect from Him.

But the Gospels and the book of Acts do not give us a sufficient acquaintance with Jesus Christ. We need to know what He does in the individual soul. We need to know what His spiritual presence means in the heart of man. Some one must tell us that story of Jesus, matching the story of His earthly ministry, before we are quite ready to go forth and proclaim His Gospel to burdened and dying sinners.

It is through Paul that we have received this permanent record of Christ's work in the soul. To this end was given unto him that wonderful experience. Note again Paul's words to Timothy, and see how large is their meaning: "Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me as chief might Jesus Christ shew forth all his longsuffering, for an ensample of them who should hereafter believe on him unto eternal life."

AN IDEAL EXPERIENCE

It is an ideal experience which was revealed unto Paul, and through him unto the church. As we must constantly go back to Pentecost in order to comprehend both the method and the measure of the Spirit's ministry unto the church, so must we constantly return to the revelation of Christian experience found in Paul's letters in order to understand how the Spirit works in the individual soul, and what is the fullness of His blessing. There have been men since Paul's day whose experiences were full and deep; but none have surpassed his. His stands displayed in his Epistles, the ideal for which we long and strive, but beyond which we never hope to go.

This experience is ideal because of its many-sidedness. Where do we find any experience to-day which equals this in the range of its sympathies and the multiplicity of its interests? There are mystics to-day, but none of them surpass the passionate devotion of him who said: "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me." There are others to-day glowing with ardent zeal for a righteous, holy life; but none of them can go beyond him who wrote: "I therefore so run as not uncertainly; so fight I as not beating the air: but I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage: lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected." There are some to-day who have visions of glory most enrapturing. But surely they do not quite equal that of Paul, who was caught up into Paradise, and heard "unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man

to utter." Viewed from any standpoint, and compared with all others, Paul is not found in any respect deficient in matters of Christian experience.

Not only was Paul's own experience so great that it must ever be our standard; it was also great enough to give him understanding of others, and to enable him to interpret to them the meaning of their own spiritual life. When we read those letters of his we not only see reflected from them the noble Christian life of Paul, with its manifold experiences and interests, but we find in them also the picture of life in the church of his day. There was spiritual experience besides his own, akin to his own; and the meaning of it he was qualified to interpret.

Not only was Paul's experience great enough to enable him to understand and interpret the experience of his fellow Christians; it was great enough to qualify him to understand and interpret the mysteries of God Himself. No other ever walked the earth, except Jesus Christ, who had such a vision of divine realities as was given to Paul. It came to him through a holy experience, imparted by the Spirit of God. By virtue of that experience he becomes for us a guide and helper in understanding the deep things of God.

If asked what is the chief value of Paul's Epistles for modern Christians, we have no difficulty in making answer. They are for the stimulus and guidance of the spiritual life. They make plain the essential features of that life. They show its relation to Christ. They declare the fullness of its blessings. They help to call forth such faith in Christ as must result in some measure of the liberty and joy of a genuine Christian experience. The proper use of these Epistles is to find in them help unto such an end. Theologians have em-

ployed them as the foundation for great doctrinal systems. Some have found in them petty rules of conduct. But surely that Spirit who inspired Paul would have us mainly use them to bring us into the possession of experiences like his.

THE SUBSTANCE OF THE REVELATION

The truth which was revealed to Paul, which he discloses to us through his Epistles, and which is confirmed by our own heart experiences, is truth concerning the unseen world, the world of spirit. It has many aspects. Let us look at three, namely, the reality of the divine Kingdom, the Lordship of Christ, and the ministry of the Holy Spirit.

The Kingdom of God. Behind this visible order in which our earthly life is set lies another, unseen and eternal. To it Jesus constantly directed the thoughts of men. He spoke of its authority, of its blessings, of its methods. His message was the good news concerning it, "the gospel of the kingdom."

To Paul was made known the reality and significance of this unseen and divine order of life. This is the origin of Paul's mysticism. He had been made acquainted in some measure with another world, which is profoundly interested in this world. Out of it continually flow holy powers and evil temptations. In that world is existent a dominion which rules in love and righteousness. It is "the kingdom of God," "the kingdom of Christ," "the kingdom of his dear Son," "the heavenly kingdom."

In this we find the essential agreement of Paul's message with that which came from the lips of Jesus. They both emphasize the Gospel. It is "the gospel of the kingdom." The Kingdom is "the kingdom of

heaven." It is not to be identified with any earthly order, nor with any earthly blessings. It is not a kingdom which man is to set up. It cannot be builded. It comes unto men. It is revealed out of the unseen. Its strength does not lie in man's moral sense, nor in man's will, but in the infinite resources of Heaven.

The reality of this Kingdom was made known to Paul by the great unveiling of the unseen with which his Christian life began. Its reality is always confirmed to those who accept the Gospel of the crucified and risen Christ as did Paul.

The Lordship of Jesus. The Kingdom has a head, and that head is the Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus made this His own great claim. He asserted that He was king, and declared that His Kingdom was not of this world.

When Saul of Tarsus was won to discipleship, this fact of the Lordship of Jesus was revealed to him, and was his real initiation into the realities of the divine Kingdom. Jesus the crucified Nazarene he discovered to be the living Lord. In all sincerity he gave himself unto a new allegiance.

The Lordship of Jesus is not established by earthly forces or agencies. Its sphere is not primarily amid the fleeting conditions of earth. That sphere is the Kingdom of Heaven. But it has vital relations with earth. Here something has occurred which establishes the authority of Christ. It is a crucified Christ whom God has highly exalted and given a Name that is above every name. There are eternal values belonging to the cross.

The Lordship of Jesus is authoritative on earth because of its authority in the Heavenly Kingdom. Heaven stoops to earth with blessings, and also with

righteous claims. This claim was recognized the very moment Paul caught sight of the eternal realities, and his response was the cry, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

Christian ethics, as interpreted by Paul, have their own peculiar foundation. His appeal for right living is one for loyalty to the experience granted to believers. They are to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they have been called. The vices of the past, the corruptions of heathenism, the subtle sins of the heart are to be shunned because they are out of harmony with that unseen realm whose secrets have been partly revealed to them through faith in Jesus Christ. He is King. They do not make him king by a holy life, but holy living is the way they are to recognize and honor the gifts that the Heavenly King has bestowed upon them. They are not exhorted to walk worthy of their *profession*, but of their *calling*.

The Ministry of the Spirit. The unseen divine Kingdom is continually reaching out to touch men. Its contact with this world is one of spirit. The Son of God, incarnated in Jesus of Nazareth, now Lord of glory, still interests Himself in human life and still reveals Himself unto men. This manifestation is not to the senses, but to the spirit. The relation of the Heavenly Kingdom with men is one of salvation. God's saving grace is revealed, not through outward miracle, but through the ministry of the Holy Spirit.

All this Paul found out by what came into his life. Such knowledge was confirmed by what he discovered in others as the result of Christian faith. It is written down, incidentally but clearly and positively, in these familiar letters. Writing on various themes, giving counsel as to all sorts of matters, he constantly speaks

of the Spirit as a great reality of Christian experience. So he strengthens the faith of the churches, and helps to establish their life.

Jesus gave to His disciples the promise of the coming of the Holy Spirit. Pentecost was the disclosure of a spiritual presence and spiritual energies. The full truth was disclosed as the church went on with its life. Then was found the meaning of a divine presence in assemblies of worship, when Christ fulfilled His promise of being present with those gathered in His Name. Then also was found the blessed fruitage of the Spirit's ministry in the heart of the believer, His love and joy and peace.

The links that bind us with the early church are a common faith and common experiences. We know practically nothing of the special circumstances that drew forth the letters of Paul, but we share in the ministries of the Holy Spirit to which they bear witness. These letters speak a language that we can understand. They quicken our faith when it becomes lifeless. They strengthen our love for Him who died for us, but who is forever our living Lord. Thus has it been through the centuries. To one who had been a persecutor came the call that made him an apostle, and into his heart was poured such a disclosure of unseen realities that he could speak of being "filled unto all the fullness of God." His spiritual enlightenment has guided the church unto clear knowledge of Jesus Christ, and blesses us in this our day.

CHRONIC UNBELIEF

By REV. A. C. WYCKOFF, author *The Science of Prayer*, *The Unbelieving Psychologists and the Christian Faith*, *The Non-Sense of Christian Science*

WHILE there are those who fight their doubts and by overcoming them find a stronger faith their own, there are also always a small number who are so constituted that from the very early days of childhood they reverse the process, and fight their faith and foster their doubts. With few exceptions, these furnish us with our chronic unbelievers.

Chronic unbelief, as stated in a previous article, is an attack from which the person does not recover in a normal and healthy manner. To compensate for this great loss of religious faith and experience, the chronic unbeliever struggles to make a virtue out of his affliction by consoling himself with the idea that his keen mind, superior knowledge, intellectual honesty, and high courage are the causes of his unbelief. He cannot help his superiority, or consent to think with the crowd. This unconscious self-flattery is one of the strong tenets of the cult of the unbelievers. It is the veritable staff of their spiritual life, the bread and wine of their communion feasts. The keen-minded, intelligent, intellectually honest, courageous believers indulge this conceit on the part of unbelievers with amazing generosity.

Professor Leuba stresses this conceit as the central appeal of his position. Again and again he states that, among the greater scientists and the most eminent specialists, the larger percentage of unbelief is found. And

as for the college students, it is their widening intellectual horizon and maturing mental powers that cause their growing unbelief. He concludes his book, *A Psychological Study of Religion*, with this statement:

The leaders in philosophy, science, literature, and even in religion, as well as increasing numbers of the rank and file, reject openly or secretly the traditional Christian belief in a Divine Father in direct communication with man [p. 315].

The necessary price, these unbelievers would imply, one is compelled to pay for moving up out of the average group into the cultural realm, and for possessing natural gifts which lead to eminence, is loss of religious belief. Therefore one endowed with intellectual gifts leading to eminence is left no choice. For such, religious unbelief is inevitable.

A guilty feeling something akin to sacrilege steals over one when forced to disturb this long-cherished conceit of unbelievers. But two obvious facts challenge its truth. They are:

First. Not all intellectual persons endowed with natural gifts leading to eminence, though they possess exactly the same scientific knowledge, equal intellectual integrity, and unquestioned high courage, are unbelievers. The unbelievers are the ones who get the public's ear. And conversely, not all unbelievers are possessed of this much-vaunted keenness of mind, superior knowledge, intellectual integrity, and high courage. A few of the most famous unbelievers, the leaders of the cult, do possess these gifts, but the full roll of unbelievers includes a motley throng of defectives, delinquents, criminals, anarchists, bolsheviki, and ignorant. Man for man, they average far lower in the scale of intellectual, moral, social, and spiritual development than the much-despised rank and file of believers. And as for eminence, does not Professor James make this confession?

The best fruits of religious experience are the best things that history has to show. * * *

The highest flights of charity, devotion, trust, patience, bravery to which the wings of human nature have spread themselves, have been flown for religious ideals. [Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 259 f.]

History confirms Professor James' verdict. It unhesitatingly accords its highest place of honor to the greatest religious believer of the centuries—Jesus of Nazareth. This more accurate checking up of the intellectual status of the unbelievers, when compared with those of believers, forces the psychologist to search in some other quarter for the tap-root of unbelief.

Second. The unbelief of the present is not born of modern scientific discovery. In another article we may discuss this point. At present we wish to call attention to the fact that the presence of the materialists first on the field of scientific discovery has tended to create this impression. But he is ill-informed who thinks that materialism holds the thinking mind of to-day. Twenty years ago pure materialism was abandoned, and from that time to the present every modification of its fundamental principle, which still holds to the universal operation of mechanism, has met the same fate. Those in close touch with scientific discovery and philosophical thinking perceive that the tide has turned against this theory. And it takes no great prophet to predict that the next twenty years are going to witness as radical a revolution in the realm of religious thought as has been experienced during the last century. And this change is not going to be reactionary in its nature. It will be a new point of view growing directly out of the scientific progress which has been gained, and it will include and conserve all the assured results of this great era of seeking and finding. The tidal wave of new scientific

knowledge which flooded this modern world naturally swept religious thinkers and leaders off their feet, as it did all other thinkers. We are beginning to get our intellectual footing, and are now ready to make some sure intellectual and religious progress. Biology, medicine, and psychology, the principal offenders against religious belief, are already beginning to atone for having wrought such havoc with religious faith, and are today most conspicuous among the reconstructive sciences. The intellectual horizon of the historic Christian religion has not been as radiant with light for a hundred years. This, therefore, is not the psychological moment to stress superior knowledge as the foundation of *unbelief*.

It has been a common practice to lay all the responsibility for unbelief upon the unreasonableness of beliefs. Psychology has taught us that all unbelief contains two factors, either of which has the power to turn the will-to-believe for or against any belief. These are the belief itself, and the believer. Gross unreasonableness, logical inconsistency, scientific ignorance, philosophical defects, naturally make any religious belief untenable for the educated. But it is equally true that when these same defects are found in the unbeliever, his unbelief becomes unreasonable. The exact percentage of unbelief which is due to the nature of the belief, and that which is due to the nature of the unbeliever is an interesting psychological study. In acute unbelief the percentages vary widely; sometimes the balance turns against the belief and sometimes against the unbeliever. In chronic unbelief by far the largest proportion of unbelief is due to the nature of the unbeliever. Therefore this phase of the problem will claim our attention.

In a poem entitled *Credo*, Richard Watson Gilder dramatically phrases our problem thus:

How easily my neighbor chants his creed
Kneeling beside me in the House of God.
His "I believe" he chants, and "I believe,"
With cheerful iteration and consent—
Watching meantime the white, slow sunbeam move
Across the aisle, or listening to the bird
Whose free, wild song sounds through the open door.

Thou God supreme—I too, I too, believe!
But O, forgive, if this one human word,
Binding the deep and breathless thought of Thee
And my own conscience with an iron band,
Stick in my throat. I cannot say it, thus—
This "I believe" that doth Thyself obscure.

We can forgive any adolescent who, during an attack of acute unbelief, finds these words, "I believe," sticking in the throat. This is one of the sympathetic symptoms of the malady. Most of us have experienced it. But when the difficulty increases with the years and becomes aggravated with age it is a symptom of chronic unbelief. It becomes an alarming symptom when an adult begins to indulge the idea that a vague, undefined, nebulous religious belief which shrinks from verbal expression is superior intellectually and spiritually to one which binds the deep and breathless thought of God in the clear concept of an expressed idea. Reluctance to express in words one's religious belief is a virtual confession that one secretly fears that his faith will not fare well in the open. As we may see in later studies, this is a characteristic feature of all occultism and super-beliefs, with which the chronic unbeliever does not suspect that he has anything in common.

When the words, "I believe," grow more and more difficult for the mature adult to say, a pathological condition is developing which needs attention. The physician occasionally encounters a person who has great diffi-

culty in swallowing a pill which the majority of normal persons swallow without it sticking in their throats. In such a case the physician does not lay the trouble to the pill but to the patient. In the same way, when the psychologist finds here and there a chronic unbeliever who cannot say, "I believe," when kneeling in the house of God and repeating the familiar words of a creed which the majority of equally intelligent and sincere persons repeat without any intellectual hesitation, he is inclined to lay the trouble, not to the belief, but to the unbeliever. The imagination has a strange way of erecting inhibitions which abnormally exaggerate the difficulty of swallowing pills and making "I believe" stick in the throat of unbelievers.

Let us now get a little better acquainted with the chronic unbeliever, and see whether the reason for his abnormal difficulty in saying, "I believe," can be discovered. Religious belief is not the only thing the chronic unbeliever finds it difficult to approve. Generally he is constitutionally opposed to the things the majority favor, and for those the majority oppose. He nourishes the conceit that he is different from the average. This disposition can be traced to an early childhood kink in temperament which was not overcome by discipline. It is a legacy bequeathed by the home atmosphere where some maladjustment, continuing throughout the years of childhood and youth, left a trauma, or life-wound, in the sensitive psychological nature of the child which has created a negative resistance, tinged with emotional hostility around which continual family disagreement has developed a complex.

First, then, the child is different in the home circle, next in school, and as the relations of life broaden and become social the young person is different in these.

This difference is always characterized by a reaction against those things which the majority do or favor. Naturally it breaks out most violently at the point where one's dominant life-interest or maladjustment is touched. If this home is one in which politics has been the dominant interest, the chronic unbeliever will be against the government, all government, or at least the party in power. If social, he will be consistently against the economic system in control. If religious, he will be against the church and its creeds. Most chronic unbelievers expend their aggressive antagonisms against a single interest. Once in a while there arise iconoclasts, like Brann, Elbert Hubbard, and H. G. Wells, who take a turn at attacking every well established institution and tradition of society. With them their religious unbelief is only an element in their nonconformity of spirit.

As Mr. H. G. Wells is the best known living example of this type we will study him. The English have made no secret of the annoyance which Mr. Wells' constitutional opposition to all the deeper interests which make up true national loyalty gives them. In his book, *My Dear Wells*, his fellow-countryman, Mr. Henry Arthur Jones, says:

We have among us a group of "thinkers" and writers whom I call "The Haters of England." They always "think" against their own country. If there is a sedition and revolt in any part of the Empire, they stir it up. If there is trouble and unrest at home, they foment it. * * * During the war they were worth many army corps to Germany. Now that the war has left us a legacy of new insecurities and perils, now that it is a first necessity that our nation should gather itself in one great unity of aim and effort to ward off disaster, these haters of England are busy spreading disaffection and disunion both in our internal and in our foreign affairs.

He concludes this general arraignment of the "Haters of England" with this specific charge:

Mr. Wells is one of the most popular and influential of these "thinkers" and writers who "think" and write against England [p. VI f.].

Those familiar with Mr. Wells' writings can accept this English estimate of his constitutional iconoclastic attitude, and so select him as a representative type of the chronic unbeliever. We are most concerned with his religious iconoclasm. Those who have read Mr. Britling Sees It Through, God the Invisible King, The Soul of a Bishop, and The Outlines of History are well acquainted with this.

The readers of his Outlines of History have been impressed with his colossal attempt to cover the whole range of knowledge. And those who have read the mass of literature which has grown up around this work have discovered that in each department of knowledge the real experts find his presentation most unsatisfactory. This is equally true in the department of religion. Those familiar with the assured results of Biblical and historical criticism find very few of his statements which can claim the support of the consensus of competent scholars. In the place of the assured findings of recognized and sane experts he sets down the wild fancies of his own superficial opinions. The harm wrought by this mass of unreliable information is intensified by the fact that for the great majority of his readers this is their first introduction to the critical study of the Bible and the beginnings of Christianity. So that all his statements carry the force of a new revelation. And coming as they do in the midst of such an overwhelming mass of information upon every conceivable subject, the uninformed are disposed to accept them as reliable. We would not

question Mr. Wells' sincerity; yet, what qualifications entitle him to be accepted as an authority when his hastily formed opinions run counter to the assured findings of scholarly experts who have spent a lifetime in accurate and sympathetic study of these subjects?

Before accepting him as such an authority one should bear in mind that Mr. Wells' religious experience has been pronouncedly erratic and abnormal. In God the Invisible King he calls our attention to the fact that many children in childhood have their tender religious natures permanently injured by "nurse-maid" teaching concerning God. He says:

Many minds never rise again from their injury. They remain for the rest of life spiritually crippled and debased, haunted by a fear, stained with a persuasion of relentless cruelty in the ultimate cause of all things.

And then he adds this personal confession:

I, who write, was so set against God, thus rendered. He and his Hell were the nightmare of my childhood; I hated him while I still believed in him, and who could help but hate? I thought of him as a fantastic monster, perpetually spying, perpetually listening, perpetually waiting to condemn and to "strike me dead;" his flames as ready as a grill-room fire. * * * When I was still only a child of thirteen, by the grace of the true God in me, I flung this Lie out of my mind, and for many years, until I came to see that God himself had done this thing for me, the name of God meant nothing to me but the hideous scar in my heart where a fearful demon had been. [P. 44.]

These quotations acknowledge the existence of the complex we are seeking to establish as always in the background of the early childhood religious experience of the chronic unbeliever. Mr. Wells' childhood reaction to the traditional theology of his day was not healthy or normal. He cries out: "Who could help but hate?" The answer is, The normal childish reaction to this very

teaching concerning God is not hate, but love. The great majority of the older generation of the lovers of God were raised upon this very theology. It is interesting to recall that Robert Louis Stevenson was brought up upon this very same theological teaching. His nurse-maid, equally with the one of whom Mr. Wells complains, was a staunch Calvinist, and his home was very religious. But during his childhood days Stevenson experienced no violent reaction against the religious teaching of his home. His childhood religious experience was normal and healthy. To be sure, when he began his university studies he became a victim of a very severe attack of acute unbelief, but from this natural adolescent experience he finally recovered, and has left us a splendid legacy of morning and evening prayers.

Mr. Wells tells us that at the early age of thirteen he flung this "Lie" out of his mind. This was years before his knowledge of evolution and Biblical and historical criticism created any intellectual problems of unbelief for him. It is important to note that he approached his scientific and critical studies with an emotional hostility toward religious belief. For many years, he tells us, God meant nothing to him but "a hideous scar" in his heart "where a fearful demon had been." This gave him an abnormal religious experience. It took the war with its tremendous emotional disturbances to break up this deep-seated complex and throw open his mind to even the elemental facts of religious faith. If the war had lasted long enough and its disturbance had continued personal enough, Mr. Wells might have advanced from a believer in a finite God to a Christian believer.

Let us now study a typical intellectual chronic unbeliever. When Professor Leuba says, "I cannot per-

suade myself that divine personal beings, be they primitive gods or the Christian Father, have more than a subjective existence" (see *A Psychological Study of Religion*, p. 10), he confesses that he does not believe in the fundamental truth upon which historic Christianity is founded. As we have already learned, he is the most outspoken and aggressive of all the unbelieving psychologists. Therefore he furnishes for our study the best example of the intellectual unbeliever. Where one's career has been scholarly, usually the childhood maladjustment has not been as violent as in the case of Mr. Wells. Yet, in most instances, the homes from which aggressive chronic unbelievers come have been deeply religious, and the child for some reason has failed to adjust himself harmoniously to the imperious demands of this dominant home interest—religion. This failure throws upon its victim the necessity of justifying a continued unyielding attitude by resorting to the natural psychological reaction to such a demand—the heroic effort to convert others to like unbelief. Spiritual discomfort is generally its germ.

The details of information concerning the religious atmosphere of his childhood home have not been given by Professor Leuba. Yet we know that his family descended from French Huguenots who took refuge in Switzerland at the time of the great persecutions. In a French Huguenot home religion was bound to be the subject of dominant interest. His education on the continent of Europe encouraged the development of his naturally skeptical turn of mind. In 1895 he was a fellow at Clarke University, Worcester, Massachusetts, where under Dr. G. Stanley Hall he studied for his degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Those who are acquainted with Dr. Hall's works, especially his monu-

mental work entitled *Jesus Christ in the Light of Psychology*, know that this period of study would tend to foster his already well-defined attitude of unbelief. One incident from this period of his educational career will help to throw light upon our search for the cause of Professor Leuba's unbelief.

In 1895 Mr. Charles F. Cutter, then the leader of the Old Fulton Street Noonday Prayermeeting, became interested in the subject of religious conversion. In order to obtain reliable scientific data upon this subject he conceived the idea, then a new one, of sending out a questionnaire containing a number of questions such as these: How long ago were you converted? At what age? Were you brought up by Christian parents? What religious education did you receive? etc. Before his plan was put into execution this questionnaire came into the hands of Mr. Leuba of Clarke University, who became greatly interested in the project from a psychological point of view. After some correspondence Mr. Leuba was taken in to assist Mr. Cutter. The questionnaire was duly arranged and circulated through the press and private correspondence, and many answers from people in this country and Europe were received. This material, supplemented by biographies, Mr. Leuba made the basis of his degree thesis on *Religious Conversion*. The thesis is a splendid piece of original, critical work. It is one of the first efforts made in America to subject the phenomena of religious experience to the scrutiny of psychological analysis.

But the conclusions of this thesis did not entirely satisfy Mr. Cutter. He also had examined all of the replies which had been received, and he felt that Mr. Leuba had not done full justice to the facts which the answers to the questionnaire furnished. Therefore, as

soon as the letters came back into his possession, he took a very scholarly friend and writer into his confidence, told him of his disappointment, turned over to him all of these letters, and asked him to make a thorough examination of the material and write his conclusions. The friend took the letters, expecting to comply with this request, but ill-health lasting for many years held up the project.

After the appearance, in 1912, of Professor Leuba's book, *A Psychological Study of Religion*, we were so amazed at the arbitrary way in which he rejected psychological data that we wrote a series of articles entitled *The Psychologist among the Theologians*, and *The Theologian among the Psychologists*, in which we called attention to this unwarranted rejection of such important religious data as are contained in the Bible and in the religious experience of Jesus. Soon after the appearance of these articles, a letter was received from the previously mentioned friend of Mr. Cutter, telling the story of the questionnaire and asking if we would consent to undertake the long delayed task of examining this material. So that we now have in our possession the original letters upon which Mr. Leuba based the conclusions found in his thesis on *Religious Conversion*. A careful study of them reveals sound justification for Mr. Cutter's disappointment.

All of the data used by Mr. Leuba are well analyzed, but the facts left out of his calculation are most significant. Some inhibitions clearly biased his selection of material. And this in the early days when he was a student at Clarke University. No doubt he honestly believes that the twenty-five years of psychological study are the cause of his anti-theistic and anti-Christian position. But, as we may see later, every item of this unbe-

lief is contained in his maiden thesis, written at Clarke University in 1895. In other words, he was already an unbeliever before he began to investigate the psychological data of religious experience, and this unbelief was the dominant factor in controlling his selection of data.

It must be borne in mind that the chronic unbeliever's mind is keen enough, his reasoning powers are in good working order, but he is not in possession of all the facts in the case. His early childhood maladjustment-complex is in perpetual conspiracy with the motivated-will-to-think so that selective attention is not impressed with facts that are untouched with emotional interest and hostilely regarded by inhibitions, the very facts which are of crucial importance. Those who are not victims of traumas and complexes have open minds to receive this additional evidence, even from their opponents. The victims of acute unbelief eagerly welcome it. But the chronic unbeliever's mind is unable to appreciate its force. The facts surround him, but he does not see their value. This is the reason why it is a waste of time to try to convert a chronic unbeliever by arguing with him. Facts, logic, reason, have no force as long as this psychological complex is not broken up. It is like trying to convert a stand-pat politician to another political point of view. He may read all the arguments of his opponent, and yet remain unmoved. Not until some mighty emotional experience breaks the grip of this complex on the motivated-will-to-think, and so releases it from selective attention charged with emotional interest, can the chronic unbeliever be altered in his opinion. Analytical psychology is able to furnish valuable assistance at this point.

No treatment of chronic unbelief is complete without a study of the most notorious of all chronic unbe-

lievers, Friedrich Nietzsche. The world war made us all somewhat familiar with his philosophy. Nietzsche was neither a freak nor an accident in the intellectual life of Germany. He was the direct and legitimate product of his natural environment and personality. We regret that the limits of this article will not permit us to go into this subject more thoroughly. But we can sketch its outlines.

Nietzsche furnishes us with the best example we have yet had of the operation of the psychological law of reversed effort. In early childhood he also experienced a maladjustment to the religion of his home. It will surprise some to learn that he descended from a long line of ministerial ancestry. His father was a Lutheran clergyman. He died when Friedrich was a boy of five. From a child Nietzsche was passionate, intense, proud, conceited, self-willed, supersensitive, eccentric. Soon after his father's death his mother took him and his sister to Naumburg, where all of her family lived. There Nietzsche grew up under the petticoat government of his mother and aunts. In early childhood he was deeply religious, but as he grew to self-consciousness and independence he rebelled against the religious restrictions of the home. In time he became too much of a problem for his mother and his aunts. Their prim, precise, pious precepts and practices first irritated, then infuriated him. To assist in enforcing discipline they invoked the aid of religion, in the way many helpless parents do, insisting that their way is right and that God will punish those who do not do right. His natural waywardness, and this petulant practice stirred up in him an intense hatred of religion.

His alert mind soon perceived that if he was to have any peace of mind one of two decisions must be made.

It must be either Thy will, or mine, be done. Jesus gained His marvelous peace of mind and strength of character by choosing the first alternative: "Not my will, but thine, be done." Nietzsche determined he would never make this choice. From the moment of this decision, he hated Jesus; His presence taunted and haunted him. This early resistance and decision formed the nucleus-complex around which developed his attitude of emotional hostility to Christianity. Again we pause to call attention to the fact that Nietzsche's unbelief in its inception, like all chronic unbelief, was not an intellectual, but rather a spiritual and moral, problem. Dr. Paneth, his faithful friend, has shown that Nietzsche always worked from his feelings outward. We learn, then, that from early childhood Nietzsche fought his faith and fostered his doubts. In his student days he came upon Strauss' *Leben Jesu*. From the first this book fascinated him. By his mythical interpretation of the Jesus of the Gospels Strauss brought relief to Nietzsche's mind from the ever present, haunting example of the real Jesus. After this he fell under the successive influences of Schopenhauer, Ritschl, Voltaire, and Wagner. But still he could find no real peace of mind. Next to Jesus, the church which nourished His religion infuriated him. In typical Voltairean style he attacked this. Here is one passage:

The Christian Church is to me the greatest of all imaginable corruptions; it has had the will to the ultimate corruption that is possible. The Christian Church has left nothing untouched with its depravity, it has made a worthlessness out of every value, a lie out of every truth, a baseness of soul out of every straightforwardness. [Antichrist, sect. 62, quoted in *The Will to Freedom*, by Figgis, p. 6.]

Calling Zarathustra to his aid, he sends him forth to preach and to teach. Zarathustra is the antichrist who

closely parallels the Jesus of the Gospels, only he always teaches opposite life-principles. It is impossible in such a short sketch to give any adequate idea of Nietzsche's vehement opposition to the teaching of Jesus. Two short quotations will convey a faint idea of its character. In one passage he says:

I call Christianity the one great curse, the one great intrinsic depravity, the one great instinct of revenge, for which no expedient is sufficiently poisonous, secret, subterranean, mean. I call it the one immortal blemish of mankind. [Quoted by Figgis, *ibid.*, p. 104.]

In another place he exclaims:

That which deifies me, that which makes me stand apart from the whole of the rest of humanity, is the fact that I have unmasked Christian morality. [Quoted by Figgis, *ibid.*, p. 105.]

Volume after volume rolls from his pen reeking with similar anathemas against the church, Jesus Christ, and Christianity. In the background of all his writing is plainly evident his desire to be free from the restraints of religion. Zarathustra is his ideal, and Zarathustra is free, because ungodly. Again and again he insists that nothing is to be gained by being free from belief in God if one still remains in the prison house of an ethical system which is derived from belief in God. Therefore he portrays a group in society who are "Beyond Good and Evil." These are those who are free indeed. All this, growing out of that early childhood failure successfully to adjust his personality to the religion of his home and church. Never for one moment was he able to escape the haunting presence of the Jesus whom he rejected. This Jesus said: "Not my will, but thine, be done," and He preached an ideal Kingdom of God in which the individual becomes so socialized that he loves God and his neighbor. Nietz-

sche said: "Not Thy will, but mine, be done," and he preached the doctrine of the superman who, to become the beast and monster (these are Nietzsche's own words) necessary to attain to the ideal superman, must hate both God and his neighbor. And now for the result.

Nietzsche attempted the impossible—and the struggle was too much for him. Everything in his life went to smash, his home, his friendships, his career. By the time he is forty-five his mind breaks and he goes to an insane asylum. His good physician endeavors to convince the world that his eyes caused his insanity, but the psychologist now knows too much about this type of insanity to ignore the fact that there were psychological causes at work which assisted. All through his life, Nietzsche played false with God's great gifts to him—a brilliant mind and a Christian heritage. Instead of using his gifts in the service of God and the truth, he perverted them in an effort to destroy God and the truth. With consummate conceit he exclaims, "That which deifies me," as though *he* had attained to the rank of deity. In another passage he makes Zarathustra exclaim: "If there be a God, how could I bear not to be one?" From early childhood he poured all the energy and brilliance of his mind into the futile attempt to make the reasonable unreasonable and the unreasonable reasonable; to make good evil and evil good; to put light for darkness and darkness for light, and the woe of the prophet, who was a good psychologist, fell upon him. He fought against elemental reality and truth, and, in the last analysis, this is madness. It is the essence of atheism. The thing that saves most chronic unbelievers from Nietzsche's fate is the simple fact that they do not take their unbelief so seriously.

In the case of H. G. Wells and Professor Leuba their resistance-complex affected only their intellectual attitude toward the beliefs of historic Christianity. In the moral and psychological realms, inhibitions were encountered which obstructed its further invasion of their lives. In Nietzsche's case he allowed his unbelief free range through his intellectual, moral, and spiritual life. When once unbelief gets such a hold upon a personality, in time everything gives way under the strain. The cure for chronic unbelief we hope to take up later.

No doubt, while this study has been progressing, some have been wondering whether this resistance-complex idea does not work both ways? Can it not cause belief as well as unbelief? Let us frankly confess that believers are no more free from suspicion than unbelievers. Our psychological natures are no respecters of complexes. They can turn for or against belief with equal ease. In one case you have chronic unbelievers, in the other case, superb believers. When any Christian or minority group allows Christianity to be summed up in terms of one doctrine upon which equally intelligent and sincere Christians differ, such a person is approaching the danger point of a complex. A complex can be recognized by the fact that it is always either an individual, class or small minority affair. It never controls majorities. In other words, it is not a *normal* religious experience.

“THE HOUND OF HEAVEN”¹

By REV. T. H. WRIGHT, Chaplain of the Scots Church, Paris

How far *The Hound of Heaven*, Francis Thompson's great poem, is consciously autobiographical is open to discussion, and in due time the problem may occupy a place in the history of literature similar to that raised by Dante's *Divina Commedia*. We have no clear evidence that either Dante or Francis Thompson ever passed through positive irreligion or sensuality, but we may well believe that their sensitive consciences so interpreted their time of lapse and their forgetfulness of many high obligations. Neither of these poets, in many ways so akin to each other, was ever, in his poetic work, far away from his own experience. No poet does get far away from himself, strive as he may to objectify and dramatize his theme. And Thompson's experience was so poignant that it clung to him like a Nessus shirt, while the inward inspiration was able to change the raiment of doom into the singing robes, even the pontifical vestments, of a high priest of poesy.

No work of Thompson's so well as *The Hound of Heaven* shows his distinguishing qualities as a poet, his surprises of vocabulary, his wealth and vividness of imagery, the scope of his vision. He is a most unusual poet and a most unusual personality. The luxuriant resources of his purple and gold both in thought and language are no doubt a temptation to him, but wealth of imagination is an excess which we can freely forgive.

¹ The quotations from the poems included here are used by the special and kind permission of the literary executors of Francis Thompson.

The commonplace we have always with us, but the alabaster box of very precious ointment, broken on the feet of the Highest until the house is filled with the odor, is rare.

More frequently than is at first recognized the unusual phraseology Thompson employs is drawn from poetic predecessors whose streams are part of the outflow from the well of English undefiled. And where it is original it is invariably formed on classic models, and should present no difficulty to those who are moderately familiar with the sources of our complex tongue. He certainly revels in a superabundant imagery, and sometimes one wonders if the effort is to express the inexpressible in his thought or to relieve the congestion of trope, metaphor, and allegory. On the whole we believe the thought can rival the imagery in resources. In *A Corymbus for Autumn*, his Muse comes forth as he himself describes the moon coming forth "upon the trepidant air:"

As if she had trodden the stars in press,
Till the gold wine spurted over her dress,
Till the gold wine gushed out round her feet;
Spouted over her stained wear,
And bubbled in golden froth at her feet,
And hung like a whirlpool's mist round her.

Or, to use the terms in which the poet describes his verse, at a creative period of his art, in the *Proem to Sister Songs*:

From cloud-zoned pinnacles of the secret spirit
Song falls precipitant in dizzying streams;
And like a mountain-hold when war-shouts stir it,
The mind's recessed fastness casts to light
Its gleaming multitudes, that from every height
Unfurl the flaming of a thousand dreams.

The *Hound of Heaven* was written about the year 1891, three years after he was delivered from his dere-

liction. Out of the same period came the Sister Songs, tenderly and shyly dedicated to his deliverers in the very myrrh and frankincense of verse. The glory of the spring is in these Sister Songs for it was springtime now in the poet's heart:

Mark yonder, how the long laburnum drips
Its jocund spilth of fire, its honey of wild flame:
Yea, and myself put on swift quickening,
And answer to the presence of a sudden Spring.

When the ode was published, in 1893, two years earlier than Sister Songs, it was hailed with rapturous welcome by many competent critics, who discovered in the new apparition affinities with nearly all the stars of the poetic firmament — with Shakespeare, Spenser, Milton, with Blake and Shelley, but especially with Crashaw, Donne, Herbert, and Southwell. The discernment was true, for he combines qualities of them all, draws upon them for his vocabulary, and fuses what he borrows into originality by sheer power of imagination. His verse is compact of “ the precious things of heaven, of the dew, of the depth that croucheth beneath, of the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, of the precious things put forth by the moon.” Strength and tenderness, purity and pathos are unified in the rich, strange moods and measures of his poems. And deepest of all is their power to appeal to human experience by the poignancy of their own. Deep calleth unto deep, and the echoes awakened wander through the eternities.

The poem enshrines the flights through earth and Heaven of an ardent imagination, under constant memories of a sad, painful, and in many ways shameful lapse from the true end for which man was made — to seek and to find God and to enter into life in Him. An interpretation of its thought should reveal how far the

imaginative element transcends the experience upon which it is indubitably based. For the sake of clearness the ode is considered in sections not always indicated by the poet.

I

The title of this ode is ill chosen, according to common literary usages, to express the idea of the author. Hounds of hell of the breed of Cerberus the three-headed, which Hercules overpowered and brought up to earth from the underworld, are familiar agents of the malevolence of the universe. It is not according to analogy that the Hound of Heaven should represent life's benevolence. But the title is well chosen to arrest the attention and to make emphatic that no malevolence of the universe and no folly of man can approach in persistence the divine pursuit of the human soul.

The human desire here depicted is twofold: First, the unnatural attempt to escape from the Almighty, a purpose passionately pursued into the recesses and secretcies of the universe, but ever thwarted and finally frustrated by the more persistent pursuit by the Eternal Love. Second, the complementary and equally vain desire to find life's delight and satisfaction elsewhere. The Hound of Heaven, with the sternness and relentlessness of holy affection, tracks the fugitive into all the nestling places of life, into the splendors of the imagination, into the intimacies of Nature, and in each instance proves their hollowness as substitutes for God, and the impossibility for one who will not have God of finding any relief or rest in these substitutes, which themselves have their very being in the Deity.

The opening stanza represents that the flight from pursuing Love was both deliberate and prolonged, also that it all proceeds within his own mental experience:

I fled Him, down the nights and down the days;
 I fled Him down the arches of the years;
 I fled Him, down the labyrinthine ways
 Of my own mind.

Then in a series of finely conceived contrasts, which are characteristic of the poet, he expresses the fact that most diverse experiences succeeded in driving his heart from God, and in urging him to escape from the all-pervading persistence:

And in the mist of tears
 I hid from Him, and under running laughter.
 Up vistaed hopes I sped;
 And shot, precipitated,
 Adown Titanic glooms of chasmed fears,
 From those strong Feet that followed, followed after.

The line, "and shot, precipitated," at first shocks one with its apparent discord, its ugliness and unpoetic quality. Reflection shows that it expresses with force and appropriateness a most discordant and unpoetic fact of human experience, its suddenness, its violence, its roughly broken fall into the abyss with its appalling darkness. Thompson is a conjurer with words, and his onomatopoeitic use of pre-cip-i-ta-ted is effective.

Powerful too is the impression conveyed of the divine pursuit. The poet has entirely assimilated the value of contrasts, and here, by means of them, he expresses the eternal seeking of man. We hear, not "the patter of little feet" (Kelman), but those "strong Feet that followed," the Feet of holy urgency combined with calm, patient, reposeful dignity:

But with unhurrying chase,
 And unperturbéd pace,
 Deliberate speed, majestic instancy,
 They beat—and a Voice beat
 More instant than the Feet—

“All things betray thee, who betrayest Me.”

These effective contrasts remind of Milton's description of music, in *L'Allegro*, with its abandon, its impassioned freedom from all restraint and control which at times seem to characterize it, but which nevertheless obeys throughout the will of the composer:

In notes with many a winding bout
 Of linkéd sweetness long drawn out,
 With wanton heed and giddy cunning,
 The melting voice through mazes running,
 Untwisting all the chains that tie
 The hidden soul of harmony.

Nor must we miss the significance of the ever-recurring Voice, surpassing in urgency the sound of the Feet, which echoes from the infinite mystery: “All things betray thee, who betrayest Me.” It expresses the deep truth that flight from the Holy Compassion is a betrayal of that purpose which has entrusted us with the choice of our way, which means our good, and which depends, for its own satisfaction, on our joyful acquiescence in its will. No idea is in this poem that the Father of our spirits can “do without” our obedience, being self-centered in His own radiance. Rather are we made to feel One who cannot rejoice without the rejoicing of His children.

II

Then follows the first in a series of vain attempts to find self-realization and self-completion apart from fellowship with the Divine Love. The personality here portrayed is eager, awake, imaginative, and therefore

must seek to find that which can respond to his own inward activity. Nor is the effort to flee due to misunderstanding of the nature of the Deity, but to misinterpretation of its divine requirement of man.

For, though I knew His love Who followed,
Yet was I sore adread
Lest, having Him, I must have naught beside.

This terribly common misconception, that Christian discipleship involves the giving up of a great part of life's interest, it is the main aim of this poem to unveil and repudiate. The teaching of asceticism and renunciation which some read in this ode could not in fact be more resolutely set aside.

This alternative seeking by the soul is vain because all things, being animated by the Divine Life and existing in that Life, must prove essentially disappointing to such a perverted personality. The thought is akin to that of Browning's *Easter Day*, for both have as their theme the desolation inevitable for the life which chooses for its portion the resources of earth and humanity without their all-immanent Creator and Sustainer.

First, then, the self-outlawed spirit attempts to find satisfaction of its human need by turning to human sympathies:

I pleaded, outlaw-wise,
By many a hearted casement, curtained red,
Trellised with intertwining charities.

Part of the tragedy of Francis Thompson was his abnormal reserve of nature combined with inward longing for fellowship with his kind. The longing is foredoomed to disappointment, which comes with sternness and even violence:

But, if one little casement parted wide,
The gust of His approach would clash it to.
Fear wist not to evade, as Love wist to pursue.

This apparent harshness is the inevitable result of flight from God. The Lord of every family in Heaven and in earth is sure to come, even with divine ardor, in all human sympathies; is indeed the life of these tender-nesses and fellowships; and therefore the opening up of these sympathies must be violently closed against one who will not welcome the divine Lord of sympathy. Such a one shuts the door of life in his own face. Refusal of Divine Love involves a deep rejection of human fellowship.

III

The next recourse is to spheres far remote from humanity, beyond the borders of this world. Here the poet indulges in "a fantasy with no more than a tinge of psychic significance," as he himself declares, with far less truth, his poem, *The Mistress of Vision*, to be. He appears to base his thought and imagery upon part of the 139th Psalm, and gives poetic reality to what in the Psalmist is only hypothesis. In imagination he does ascend into the heavens, only to find God there ruling and receiving prompt and loyal obedience from all the forces of the universe. Desiring to find shelter and a hiding place, he assaults the starry realm, "troubled the gold gateways of the stars," and with more subtle and more insidious persistence seeks to fret his way into "the pale ports o' the moon"; but the one responds with the clangor of closed bars, and the other with "dulcet jars and silvern chatter." Shelter he finds in neither. He calls upon the Morning and the Evening to befriend him in his flight, and to hide him from the eyes of "this tremendous lover" beneath the blossoms of what Thompson might have called the "Uranian Orchard." But all the servitors of Divine Love

remain constant to their Lord, and therefore cannot do the will of this fugitive. In their fidelity he sees the true image, by contrast, of his own infidelity, and knows that they can never shelter one who flees from His power of which they are but aspects. The psychic element in this is the human attempt to escape the thought of God, and also of those human sympathies which had disappointed him, in boundless imaginations as far removed as possible from the apparently bounded ways of duty and obligation. We can understand that the poet himself knew the meaning of that impulse to forget much of his own failure in the revels of pure fancy.

In the same desire the fugitive takes “the wings of the morning,” hoping to find in swiftness escape from the never-halting Feet. At his suit, the winds like wild horses with whistling manes, now bore him across “the long savannahs of the blue,” and now, driven by the tempest,

Clanged his chariot 'thwart a heaven
Plashy with flying lightnings round the spurn o' their feet.

But all was in vain. Still with that majestic instancey of divine patience and passion

Came on the following Feet,
And a Voice above their beat—
“Naught shelters thee, who wilt not shelter Me.”

With boldness, but with convincing power, the poet suggests that when a human soul finds refuge in God, the Deity also finds some completion of His satisfaction, else incomplete.

IV

Baffled in these wide spaces beyond all things human, the soul turns again to his fellow creatures, and this

time not to grown-ups but to the little children. But again disillusionment awaits him:

I sought no more that after which I strayed
 In face of man or maid;
 But still within the little children's eyes
 Seems something, something which replies,
They at least are for me, surely for me!
 I turned me to them very wistfully;
 But just as their young eyes grew sudden fair
 With dawning answers there,
 Their angel plucked them from me by the hair.

The guardian angel of the children could not trust his charges to the affection of one whose persistent attempt was to repudiate God. The plucking of them away by the hair expresses the sense of extreme peril. The angels who always behold the face of the Father are aware that one who wills to be Godless cannot understand the children's deep instinct for the divine loving-kindness, and so a fatal antagonism must be set up against their peace and happiness. What element of the poet's experience is here referred to is worth consideration, for the discernment is unmistakable. We know that at this time Thompson found great joy in children of the gentler sex. In his *Sister Songs*, with lyrical abandon, he royally acknowledged the debt he owed to them when he was struggling back from the submerged depths of life:

Yet is there more, whereat none guesseth, love!
 Upon the ending of my deadly night
 (Whereof thou hast not the surmise, and slight
 Is all that any mortal knows thereof),
 Thou wert to me that earnest of day's light,
 When * * *
 Stretched on the margin of the cruel sea
 Whence they had rescued me,
 With faint and painful pulses was I lying;

* * *

At Fate's dread portal then
 Even so stood I, I ken,
 Even so stood I, between a joy and fear,
 And said to my own heart, “Now if the end be here!”

* * *

I saw thee stand
 And through my hazes
 Of pain and fear thine eyes' young wonder shone.

* * *

The heart which I had questioned spoke,
 A cry impetuous from its depth was drawn,—
 “I take the omen of this face of dawn”
 And with the omen to my heart cam'st thou.
 Even with a spray of tears
 That one light draft was fixed there for the years.²

That intimate utterance may enable us to understand the sharp suffering when Thompson came to know that it was not for him to enjoy the delights of child fellowship. The guardian angel within the child instinct would check the outgoing of the young life towards him as by a mysterious hand laid upon it. He, being what he was, very lovable in nature, yet with an inward unnaturalness, might well know that bitter experience, and it gave him an even deeper discernment. Nor was there for Thompson that more sacred love of children who should be his own offspring, the angel of the little ones standing as with flaming sword at that gate of Eden.

V

With that pendulum swing of experience which gives unity to the poem which it has been said to lack, the spirit is represented as again flinging itself upon the non-human. This alternate hope in humanity and in

² An image drawn from photography.

things extra-human is true to experience with its tendency to recoil from its disappointments to some opposite extreme of desire.

Human children being cut off from his deeper life, he will turn to the children of Nature and seek the closest intimacy there. The poet describes first the human ambition and then the realization of the bold desire, and gives one of the most delicate and searching expressions to be found in literature of what fellowship with Nature can be. One is tempted to regard the superb passages which follow as a feat of pure imagination. They certainly describe an imaginative intimacy with Nature, not a scientific intimacy, for Thompson was not an exact observer of natural objects or phenomena. He was something better, a poet spirit with susceptibilities ready to receive the finer suggestions of the natural universe. His horticultural knowledge of roses was slight, but his spiritual acquaintance with them was far more than any detached observation, even the most scientific. Human feeling enters into it, and Nature herself is humanized. Hence the signal pathos of disappointment expressed in the poem when even this almost sacramental intimacy fails to meet his need. The emotion is so profound that we are forbidden to exclude the autobiographical explanation of it. We behold, in this final effort to find life without God, the ardent longing of a true seer of Nature's glory to pierce to the secret places of her life, and we witness the desolation of spirit when this passionate and deeply successful attempt, this magnificent resource, fails him.

The ambition of this perverse seeker after life is for a very abandonment of intimacy with the children of Mother Nature and with the Lady-Mother herself:

Let me greet you lip to lip,
 Let me twine with you caresses,
 Wantoning
 With our Lady-Mother's vagrant tresses,
 Banqueting
 With her in her wind-walled palace,
 Underneath her azured dais,
 Quaffing, as your taintless way is,
 From a chalice
 Lucent-weeping out of the dayspring.

In his Essay on Shelley, Thompson defends a luxuriant use of imagery in poetry. "To sport with the tangles of Neaera's hair may be trivial idleness or caressing tenderness, exactly as your relation to Neaera is that of heartless gallantry or of love. So you may toy with imagery in mere intellectual ingenuity, and then you might as well go write acrostics, or you may toy with it in raptures, and then you may write a 'Sensitive Plant.'" Thompson's "wantoning with our Lady-Mother's vagrant tresses" expresses the closest and most reverent relations, the delicacy of the fellowship and of worship. Here he suggests the eager straining of spirit after the banqueting of delight in that imaginative intimacy, in drinking, as from a sacramental cup, along with Nature and all her forces, of the light from the primal fountain. The eternal fullness of light is conceived as distilling, one by one, its light-charged drops, like tears, into the cup which gives pure delight to all Nature, but at the same time it is not obscurely suggested that all which Nature drinks from her chalice is not more than a small part of the infinite reality, a few drops from the dayspring.

This ambitious desire was granted:

So it was done:
I in their delicate fellowship was one—
 Drew the bolt of Nature's secrecies.

The I is made emphatic, though it is not sustained. I, the child of man, perhaps also I, the one who fled from God, was admitted to this wondrous privilege. We see the poet marveling at the gifts of insight with which he was endowed even when he was least worthy of them, and his sympathy with all the changing moods of all things living or dying in Nature:

*I knew all the swift importings
On the wilful face of skies;
I knew how the clouds arise—
Spuméd of the wild sea-snortings;
All that's born or dies
Rose and drooped with; made them shapers
Of mine own moods, or wailful or Divine;
With them joyed and was bereaven,
I was heavy with the even,
When she lit her glittering tapers
Round the day's dead sanctities.
I laughed in the morning's eyes.*

The image of the doings of our several days lying each night in state, with the stars like candles lighted round them, contains a thought which somewhat shivers the average mortal. For similar powerful use of Roman Church ceremonial we may compare the opening passage from the Orient Ode:

*Lo, in the sanctuaried East,
Day, a dedicated priest
In all his robes pontifical exprest,
Lifteth slowly, lifteth sweetly,
From out its Orient tabernacle drawn,
Yon orbéd sacrament confest
Which sprinkles benediction through the dawn;
And, when the grave procession's ceased,
The earth with due illustrious rite
Blessed,—ere the frail fingers featly
Of twilight, violet-cassocked acolyte,
His sacerdotal stoles unvest—*

Sets, for high close of the mysterious feast,
The sun in august exposition meetly
Within the flaming monst'rance of the West.

In the following lines the fullness of communion with Nature is still expressed with added imagery which gives even a deeper impression of the fundamental inadequacy of it all, apart from God:

I triumphed and I saddened with all weather,
Heaven and I wept together,
And its sweet tears were salt with mortal mine;
Against the red throb of its sunset-heart
I laid my own to beat,
And to share commingling heat;
But not by that, by that, was eased my human smart.
In vain my tears were wet on Heaven's grey cheek.

A deep chasm of mutual unintelligibility stood between them. Nature, apart from the animating Deity, consisted of “things,” and he, a person, could only find satisfying fellowship with personality. Nature was but a poor step-mother. Passionately he appeals to her to unveil the very breasts of her tenderness, but in vain:

Never did any milk of hers once bless
My thirsting mouth.

Meanwhile the pursuit of Love draws ever nearer, and he hears the solemn urgent tread of the following Feet, and the Voice surpassing them in swiftness:

“Lo, naught contents thee, who content'st not Me.”

The end of man is to content his Maker, as Browning finely expresses it, “to slake the thirst of God,” and he who refuses to yield his life back to its Giver in thankfulness and fellowship cannot find satisfaction in any works of His hands, and he is debarred from ever finding the heart and life of Nature.

VI

The fugitive has come to the end of his resources. The misdirected hopes for happiness and life have proved illusory, and desolation comes upon him, and comes unconsciously, for he had been so plunged in empty hopes and so carried on by the intensity of his search for them, that he has not realized what was happening in his inward life. Defeated and defenseless before a persistent pursuit which he tries to regard as hostile to his happiness, he waits the uplifted stroke of what he knows in his heart of hearts to be Love:

Naked I wait Thy Love's uplifted stroke!
 My harness piece by piece Thou hast hewn from me,
 And smitten me to my knee;
 I am defenceless utterly.
 I slept, methinks, and woke,
 And slowly gazing, find me stripped in sleep.

In Browning's *Easter Day* the person who has, by the divine doom, been eternally confined to his own deliberate choice of the material world makes his last futile attempt to find his life in what was left in a universe without God. After successive failures he sees the figure of Christ the Judge towering above him, as a headsman with his ax, ready to make an end, and he falls prone and abject before Him.

The tragedy comes home to this vain fugitive in the impulse to reckless violence, the perversion of his thoughts mingling with some truer intuitions of the meaning of things, and in the emptiness of all, even the finest elements of life, in which he had put his trust. First, reckless revolt, leading to increase of moral failure:

In the rash lustihead of my young powers,
 I shook the pillaring hours

And pulled my life upon me; grimed with smears,
I stand amid the dust o' the moulded years—
My mangled youth lies dead beneath the heap.

Obviously the image is drawn from the ancient story of Samson bringing down the pillars of the Philistine temple and involving himself and his foes in one common ruin.

Following on this is a series of vivid images describing the futility and transitory nature of life as this fugitive had made it; like swift burning of thorns with fierce heat and end in smoke; like “sunstarts on a stream,” the brilliant, momentary flashes of sunlight on the ripples of a river. One recalls the fine lines of Burns, in *Tam o'Shanter*, in a very different connection:

But pleasures are like poppies spread,
You seize the flower, the bloom is shed.
Or like the snow falls on the river,
A moment white, then melts forever.

Misery was increased by deeper disappointment to the extremity of helplessness, and the autobiographical note becomes unmistakable. This desolate fugitive was certainly made in the likeness of the poet. He was a dreamer, always more alive to secret realities than to the tangible facts of existence. He was a poet, a Luthanist, with immense imaginative resources at command by which he even ventured “to swing the earth a trinket at his wrist.” In these terms Thompson describes the powers of fancy of which he was conscious, the fantastic flowerings of his style of which in this mood he does not seem to be greatly enamored. In *An Anthem of Earth* he distinctly disparages the fashion:

Then what use knew I of thy solemn robes,
But as a child to play with them? I bade thee
Leave thy great husbandries, thy grave designs,

* * *

And all thy ministries majestic,
 To sport with me, thy darling. Thought I not
 Thou set'st thy seasons forth processional
 To pamper me with pageant,—thou thyself
 My fellow-gamester, appanage of mine arms?
 Then with what Dionysia I, young Bacchanal,
 Danced in thy lap! Ah for thy gravity!
 Then, O Earth, thou rang'st beneath me,
 Rocked to Eastward, rocked to Westward,
 Even with the shifted
 Poise and footing of my thought!
 I brake through thy doors of sunset,
 Ran before the hooves of sunrise,
 Shook thy matron tresses down in fancies
 Wild and wilful
 As a poet's hand could twine them;
 Caught in my fantasy's crystal chalice
 The Bow, as its cataract of colours
 Plashed to thee downward.

We might regard this as an apology for, a recantation of, his style, but he was not really penitent, for the same poem and the passage itself show undisguised delight in his revellings. We cannot doubt that Thompson carefully treasured his resources of imagination. It is equally clear that these powers proved useless in his sore need. Dreams, poetry, imagination, carried to their finest issues, all yield in the strain of life, for they are

Cords of too weak account
 For earth with heavy griefs so overplussed.

We may rightly regard this as a gloomy and mistaken estimate of life, but it is entirely natural to one like Thompson amid his desperate disappointments. Equally natural are the laments and questionings which now follow. The first is identical with the fundamental misconception which gives rise to this unnatural flight from God. Is the Deity, in the evil sense, a jealous

God grudging to us all other joys of life except those
of His own giving?

Ah! is Thy love indeed
A weed, albeit an amaranthine weed,
Suffering no flowers except its own to mount?

The evil assumption is, that there are flowers not of
Love's growth, joys not of the divine giving, whereas
all that beautifies our life on the earth and the amaran-
thine growths of the Heavenly gardens are one, and
derive their life from the same divine source. This is
followed by a flash of intuition nearer to truth, and
very close to the poet's experience:

Ah! must—
Designer infinite!—

Ah! must Thou char the wood ere Thou canst limn with it?

Truly life's fires are often apparently the designed
means of preparing for great achievements in art or in
life, and the fact may reconcile us to much of the pain
and mystery of our existence, even while we maintain
that intensest joy may also be the harbinger of lofty
vision.

The next movement of these mingled strains reflects
the mental desolation which leads to a disparaging view
of his life-powers and achievements, and at the same
time recognizes the fact that they are such a reflection:

My freshness spent its wavering shower in the dust;
And now my heart is as a broken fount,
Wherein tear-drippings stagnate, spilt down ever
From the dank thoughts that shiver
Upon the sighful branches of my mind.

From retrospect he turns to anticipation. If life
now is so bitter what is to be expected from the unseen
future? The mystery of the beyond looms before his
imagination. What is hidden behind the mists that

shroud life and destiny he can only conjecture, but of the reality of eternity he is convinced. He has heard the trumpet sounding from the hidden battlements, and at times a breeze of the Spirit blows aside the mists, allowing a brief glimpse of the turrets of the Holy City before they are again engulfed, but not before he has seen "him who summoneth:"

I dimly guess what Time in mists confounds;
 Yet ever and anon a trumpet sounds
 From the hid battlements of Eternity;
 These shaken mists a space unsettle, then
 Round the half-glímpsed turrets slowly wash again.
 But not ere him who summoneth
 I first have seen, enwound
 With glooming robes purpureal, cypress-crowned;
 His name I know, and what his trumpet saith.

This arresting thought of King Death gives rise to one last revolt of the human spirit against the scheme of life and Providence:

Whether man's heart or life it be which yields
 Thee harvest, must Thy harvest-fields
 Be dunged with rotten death?

A strong and uncompromising image, appropriate to express the feeling of one bewildered by life's mystery and pain and one to whom death was at all times a waiting threat. Both his nature as a poet and his life as a man rebelled against this dread dominion.

We may compare with Thompson here a passage from Southwell, the Roman Catholic adventurer of the sixteenth century, who ended his career at Tyburn:

Did Christ manure thy heart to breed him briers?
 Or doth it need this unaccustomed soyle
 With hellish dung to fertile heaven's desires?

VII

The solution of the mystery and the issue of the experience are now at hand. The divine pursuit, which has been more or less distant like a flying rumor, draws near, and the Voice becomes an encompassing reality:

Now of that long pursuit
Comes on at hand the bruit;
That Voice is round me like a bursting sea;
“And is thy earth so marred,
Shattered in shard on shard?
Lo, all things fly thee, for thou fliest Me.”

One must notice here that the true tones of the divine Voice are only realized after a strange over-emphasis of their sterner notes. Whether the poet meant to represent this as an exaggeration of truth, natural to one like himself in a time of desperate humiliation, we cannot perhaps determine. But they are an unbalanced expression of the divine thought regarding man even in his most abject condition. The relentless statement of the issue to which his desire to find joy in earth alone had brought him is somewhat modified by the tone of the refrain. The miserable fragments of his life were evidence that everything worth seeking must prove evanescent to one who fled from God whose presence animates them all. But the contemptuous tone hardens:

“Strange, piteous, futile thing!
Wherefore should any set thee love apart?
Seeing none but I makes much of naught” (He said),
“And human love needs human meriting:
How hast thou merited—
Of all earth’s clotted clay the dingiest clot?
Alack, thou knowest not
How little worthy of any love thou art!
Whom wilt thou find to love ignoble thee,
Save me, save only Me?”

Not unnatural thoughts to be in the mind of one not yet "healed of his self-despising," but not true to the Eternal Mind. Even we ourselves must attain to that reverence for every member of the race to which we are called by remembering the divine intention for them and by discerning the image of their Creator not effaced from them. And while the All-seeing cannot overlook any of our follies and desecrations, He beholds them "with larger other eyes than ours."

Again, the poet misrepresents the Infinite Heart as forgetting the earthly embodiments of that "spark He gave us from His fire of fires," in parents, friends, and lovers innumerable. Let Browning correct Francis Thompson. In *The Ring and the Book* he makes the child-wife, Pompilia, say of Count Guido, her legal husband and her most brutal murderer, from whose violence her life was even then ebbing away:

We shall not meet in this world or the next,
 But where will God be absent? In His face
 Is light, but in His shadow healing too:
 Let Guido touch the shadow and be healed!
 And as my presence was importunate,—
 My earthly good, temptation and a snare,—
 Nothing about me but drew somehow down
 His hate upon me,—somewhat so excused
 Therefore, since hate was thus the truth of him,—
 May my evanishment for evermore
 Help further to relieve the heart that cast
 Such object of its natural loathing forth!
 So he was made; he nowise made himself:
 I could not love him, but his mother did.

Pompilia denies her love for Guido in the sense of wifely affection, but she reveals a fine type of sympathy and human reverence, an effacement of her bitter wrongs in understanding of the twisted nature of her wronger, and she is quite sure of the love his mother

bore him. She manifests that pity which is akin to the higher affection derived most directly from the Eternal.

These misconceptions which Thompson represents, these perverted thoughts concerning the divine sentiment, are true to an abnormal experience, and through them the full and glorious solution is found by the fugitive spirit. The satisfactions of life had been withdrawn, one by one, by the divine hand working through the natural necessity of things. Life is so designed that man can find the fullness of life only in the Author of life. The holy purpose to force the soul to seek the good of its being in the arms of God is no arbitrary purpose. Only there can that good be found, for life itself centers there, and when the soul turns to Him who has made us for Himself then all the apparently lost joys of our nature are found at their richest and best.

Nothing could be farther than this from any ascetic ideal of life. Thompson has been claimed as the advocate of that spirit which gives up all life's gladness for the sake of the holier joys in Christ. As a matter of fact this fugitive soul gives up nothing. One by one the natural joys are found to be impossible to him because he seeks them in a way where they cannot be found, in that way that leads away from God. None of these natural delights are in the least antagonistic to the service of Christ. When the fugitive turns to his Creator he finds them all, not their semblances, nor even their equivalents, but themselves, where they could have been enjoyed all along had they been sought aright:

All which I took from thee I did but take,
 Not for thy harms,
 But just that thou might'st seek it in My arms.
 All which thy child's mistake
 Fancies as lost I have stored for thee at home!
 Rise, clasp My hand, and come!

Every delight of life, every satisfaction of our nature—human sympathy, ardent imagination with its swift flights through the boundless spaces, the love of little children, the closest, choicest intimacy with Mother Nature—all are found in their fullness in God. The will is made accordant with His in which is our tranquility, and which is the life and ground of our entire being. Thus the secret of all religion is contained in the simple summons which closes the long controversy: “Rise, clasp My hand, and come!”

The Holy Presence is understood. The sound of the following Feet with their majestic instancy is no longer heard, for the pursuit is accomplished, and the purpose of the darkness through which the soul had been led is seen and welcomed. He had been following a true instinct of his nature in seeking the fullness of life, but had been misled by a fundamental misconception of his own good and of the divine requirement:

Halts by me that footfall:
Is my gloom, after all,
Shade of His hand, outstretched caressingly?
“Ah, fondest, blindest, weakest,
I am He Whom thou seekest!
Thou dravest love from thee, who dravest Me!”

The thought that every eager and passionate pursuit of mental and even of bodily satisfaction is essentially a seeking for that deep ultimate life which God alone is, finds great expression in this “human document.” “I am He whom thou seekest!” God and men are necessary to each other. God has made us for Himself and we cannot rest, and God cannot rest, until we rest in Him.

WHAT DID THE CROSS MEAN TO CHRIST?

By HERMAN HARRELL HORNE, Professor of the History of Education and the History of Philosophy, New York University

THE crucifixion of Christ has not been intensively studied from the standpoint of His own consciousness, at least not so far as the present writer is aware. It has been treated from the standpoints of history, art, and theology, and most intimately. History has investigated the causes and the details of the crucifixion; art has portrayed it in color, wood, and marble for the eye, and in tone for the ear, thereby bringing a realizing sense of the divine tragedy; and theology has interpreted its meaning for God and man. These treatments, though numerous and diverse, have not exhausted the exhaustless theme, even from their own standpoints, as the ever continuing new studies of the life of Christ indicate. The interest of each new generation in the central figure of our race remains unabated, as shown just now by the great popular demand for the newly translated *Life of Christ*, by Papini.

But what did the crucifixion mean to Christ Himself? This we should like to know too, that we might both understand Him better and walk in His way more intelligently and loyally.

The following study (it is undertaken on Good Friday) is only the beginning of an answer to the question. It will try to be just a plain interpretation of the moving tragic record as it lies open before us in the four Gospels. Questions of critical scholarship will not be raised. We seek now not primarily information,

but an understanding leading to an attitude. For this understanding we are now relying upon the four unique accounts. The reader will be able to test for himself the correctness of each of the several successive glimpses presented of what the cross meant to Christ.

First of all we must orient our minds, and by the aid of the imagination put ourselves back in the stream of time to the point where the cross was a symbol of shame and to hang upon the tree an accursed thing. We are in fact to study the very experience of Christ which turned the shame to glory and the curse to blessing.

The cross meant to Christ the execution of a decision reached at the temptation. The tempter had said: "If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread." To do so would have involved using His divine power to relieve His own need. It was the temptation to save Himself by a miracle, and so to look to Himself rather than God. It was the same temptation thrown at Him on the cross in mocking words: "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross." They testified of Him: "He saved others, himself he cannot save." He could not save Himself in consistency with His decision not to work a miracle in His own behalf, not to *undertrust* God. He had decided to live, so long as He lived, not "by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." So the crucifixion was just "carrying on," just carrying through, at dearest loss, a decision reached some three years earlier as to the kind of Messiah He was to be. (It is easy to believe that the fifty-third of Isaiah was much in Christ's mind during the forty days of temptation in the wilderness.) The temptation experience committed Christ to the cross, unless God should rescue Him.

The cross meant to Christ the expectation of the resurrection. When it was clearly evident, to Him at least, that His enemies would take His life, He was transfigured before certain select disciples, that they might see His glory shining through His flesh. With Moses, representing the Law, and with Elias, representing the Prophets, He spoke concerning the deacease He should accomplish at Jerusalem. It was clear in His own mind that He was to die, the Law and the Prophets had indicated sacrifice and suffering as the way of atonement, but the prospect was relieved in His own mind by the anticipation of the resurrection. So He said to the disciples when descending from the mount: "Tell the vision to no man till the Son of man be risen from the dead." The resurrection should witness to the truth of the transfiguration. Through His death would come His risen life. Spring would not be far behind winter. The shades of His prison-house would be lightened. He would die, but He would rise from the dead!

The cross meant to Christ following John the Baptist in His death. John was His cousin, a few months His senior, who became His herald. Preaching the gospel of repentance, announcing one greater than himself who should come after him, and testifying for righteousness and against spiritual wickedness in high places, he had met a violent death in the prison-fortress of Machaerus at the command of Herod the King. This death, as a martyr, of John who had baptized Him greatly affected Jesus. His most appreciative words had fallen from His lips on being interrogated by the messengers of John. Now John was dead, whose disciples had come and taken up his corpse and laid it in a tomb, and then had gone and told Jesus. At once

He withdrew from the place where He was and sought rest in a desert place. The great shadow had fallen across His way. Could it be that He too ——? Yes, so it was to be. And to His disciples, asking about Elijah coming first, as the scribes taught, He explained: "Elijah is come already, and they knew him not, but did unto him whatsoever they listed. Even so it is written that the Son of man shall suffer many things of them and be set at naught." The pitiable fate of John foreshadowed to Jesus His own.

The cross meant to Christ conformity on His part to the will and plan of God. "It is written," He often said. "What is written concerning me hath fulfillment." "The Son of man goeth as it is written of him." "The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" The submission of Jesus was not to an impersonal and inevitable fate; He did not bow to an unseen decree. He felt that the personal and loving will of God was leading Him on to whatsoever end. He cherished the thought that though His death was indicated, God could intervene, and would do so if such were His good pleasure. So He could pray: "Remove this cup from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt." So He could say: "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?" So His cross meant He was doing the will of God.

The cross meant to Christ that He Himself was to be the paschal offering. The Passover was the most sacred feast of the Jews. It celebrated the saving of their first-born from the angel of death as he passed over their blood-marked homes at the time of the Egyptian plagues and Israel's deliverance from bondage. The period of this holy festival was to be His hour.

“Ye know that after two days is the feast of the unleavened bread, which is called the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified.” “With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer.” In His own mind the paschal lamb and His own broken body and shed blood were associated.

The cross meant to Christ that thereby would come remission of sins. “This is my body which is given for you.” “This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you, which is shed for many unto remission of sins.” The first heart melted by the spectacle of the shedding of innocent blood was that of the penitent thief. “Father forgive them, for they know not what they do,” is the sublime prayer of intercession of the crucified one, betokening the remission of sin. “It was strange that one almost swooning with pain should have said the gentlest-hearted and truest thing about human nature that has ever been said since the world began” (Gerald Stanley Lee, *Business, Goodness, and Imagination*, Hibbert Journal, April, 1912, p. 651). The realizing sense of what sin costs the innocent, costs Christ, costs God, brings sinful men to penitence and forgiveness.

The cross with all its awful woe meant to Christ an occasion for thanksgiving and commemoration. One may smile through the tears, one may give blessings for curses, since “Jesus took bread, and blessed, and when he had given thanks, he broke it * * *. And he took a cup in like manner after supper and gave thanks.” “This do in remembrance of me.” He was thankful for His cup, and His gift of Himself He would have His disciples commemorate as the new Passover. So He overcame the world; so He bids us be of good cheer.

The cross meant to Christ betrayal by one disciple and desertion by all. He was to be betrayed into the hands of His enemies by a friend, a guest, one of the twelve, and by a kiss. "He that eateth my bread lifteth up his heel against me." Jesus was "troubled in spirit" at the thought of being betrayed, at the sense of woe impending over Judas. "It is one of the twelve, he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. For the Son of man indeed goeth as it hath been determined, even as it is written of him, but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed! Good were it for that man if he had not been born."

But it was not alone betrayal by a trusted friend that Jesus had to anticipate at the time of His trial and continuing temptation; there was also desertion and denial. "All ye shall be offended in me this night." "And they all forsook him and fled." "And Simon Peter followed Jesus afar off and so did another disciple." "Then he [Peter] began to curse and to swear, and saith, I know not this man of whom ye speak." "And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter," with tender reproachfulness for not having heeded the warning. Betrayal, desertion, denial, by those who had every reason to be loyal—this was a part of the sorrow of the "man of sorrows."

It should be recalled, however, that Jesus, desiring that His calamity should not also overtake His followers, had especially asked those who took Him that His disciples might "go their way." He would tread the winepress alone.

The cross meant to Christ delivery into the hands of sinful men. This, too, He had foreseen: "The Son of man shall be delivered up into the hands of sinful

men." This man, of whom the dying thief could testify that He had done nothing amiss, of whom the Roman judge could say: "I find no fault in him," was to be adjudged worthy of death by the religious leaders of His people, was to suffer indignities at their hands, was to be delivered to the hated Roman oppressors, was to be mocked as a king, spit upon in contumely, scourged as a criminal, crucified as a malefactor, and done to death. This, too, Jesus, knowing the customs of the Sanhedrim and the process of Roman law, had anticipated, though He was undeterred thereby, setting "his face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem," saying to His disciples: "He shall be delivered unto the chief priests and scribes and shamefully entreated; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles; and they shall mock him, and shall spit upon him, and shall scourge him, and crucify him, and kill him."

The cross meant to Christ an agony of soul in the garden. We are not sure of all the elements entering into this anguish. "Being in an agony he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat became as it were great drops of blood, falling down upon the ground." "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." We reverently inquire into the sources of such sorrow. Did the weakness of the flesh shrink at the torture just ahead? Escape from the garden out into the open country and away from the hands of wicked men would have been physically so easy! Could He have been fearful lest He fail to endure? Or, that He might die before the end was fully accomplished? Was the overwhelming sense of the impending disaster greater than He had anticipated? Was His sensitive soul over-borne by the enormity of the offense that would take His life?

Was He at this point vicariously sensing the guilt of mankind?

Whatever the nexus of causes of His great amazement, exceeding sorrow, and sore trouble, it is clear that it was most difficult for Him to finish His appointed mission, that He prayed to escape drinking the cup if it were possible, that He felt Himself undergoing the temptation again ("Pray that ye enter not into temptation"), that He relied upon the Father ("O my Father." "Abba, Father"), that He felt the need of human companionship ("Abide ye here and watch with me"), and that He brought His will into submission to the divine will with the heart-wringing adversatives "howbeit" and "nevertheless." The ultimate of all prayer is, "not my will, but thine."

Into the wood my Master went
Clean forspent, forspent.
Into the wood my Master came
Forspent with love and shame.

The cross meant to Christ the triumph, for a season, of the power of darkness. "The prince of darkness cometh and findeth nothing in me." "This is your hour and the power of darkness." He felt His suffering to be the effect of the presence of evil or the evil one in the world, who, however, after having destroyed the body hath nothing further that He can do. This agency of evil, entering into Judas and using the willing hearts and hands of men, brings on the final catastrophe. Jesus felt Himself the innocent victim of this malign agency—this was the cup which the Father had given Him to drink, that sins might be remitted. He was obedient unto death, even death on the cross, sensing the divine will above the power of darkness and the wrath of man.

The cross meant to Christ the enduring of undeserved ill without murmur, complaint or self-pity. The trial was unfair—the witnesses were suborned and the night time irregular for such ecclesiastical process; Pilate's attitude was that of a vacillating demagogue; the bearing of His own cross an imposition; the transfixing of the quivering flesh with crude nails most excruciating; and the railing, taunting, and jeering inhuman and fiendish. Yet He opened not His mouth, save to bid the daughters of Jerusalem not to weep for Him, but for themselves and their children.

The Synoptic picture of His tormentors scorching His soul with the same old demonic temptation as He hung on the cross is this: "And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ha! Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself; if thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross. In like manner the chief priests also with the rulers and the scribes and elders mocked him among themselves, and scoffed at him, saying, He saved others; himself he cannot save; let him save himself, if this is the Christ of God, his chosen. Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross, that we may see, and we will believe on him. He trusted on God: let him deliver him now, if he desireth him: for he said, I am the Son of God. And the soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, offering him vinegar, and saying: If thou art the King of the Jews, save thyself. And one of the malefactors who were hanged railed on him, saying, Art not thou the Christ? Save thyself and us."

We are not able with utmost appreciative sympathy to say how deeply these flaming words seared the

spirit within Him, but they are all carefully noted by the evangelists as significant.

The cross meant to Christ the abiding sense of His own Heavenly power. Though not even in extremest need would He work a miracle in His own behalf by turning stones into bread or by coming down from the cross, He yet could say to the entreating thief: "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." He suffered as He did, not through any lack of power. He lay down His life of Himself; no man took it from Him. He would die, but it would be voluntarily, and with no sense of powerlessness. His word to the dying culprit His Father would honor. The cross took His life, but not His power.

The cross meant to Christ the continuing sense of His human filial obligations. For many years before His public ministry He had been the head of the Nazareth household, in the room of His father Joseph. He had left it, only after the youngest child was well grown, in response to a more urgent call from beyond Jordan where John was baptizing. In assuming a wider obligation, however, He did not, like the Buddha, cast off the home ties. So, from the cross "when Jesus saw his mother and the disciple standing by whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son. Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother. And from that hour the disciple took her unto his own home." With the winds of eternity in His face He was not unmindful of the obligations of time.

Next we come to the desert place in the meaning of the cross to Christ. *It brought Him the sense of being forsaken of God.* "It was now about the sixth hour,

and there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour, the sun's light failing. And about the ninth hour Jesus cried out with a loud voice, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? that is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Does this cry from the depths of divine despair suggest that until this time Christ had indeed thought that God might intervene and by a miracle save Him, that now at last He knew His prayer that the cup might pass could not be answered, that His clear consciousness of God's sustaining presence was briefly obscured, that the hitherto abiding sense of divine support was gone? Or, was it only that having begun to quote the Twenty-second Psalm, which provides the answer as well as the cry, He was not able to finish? Or was it, as some think, the objective and actual withdrawal of the divine favor, a part of the price of man's redemption? Had suffering for the sin of others brought the innocent to question God? Whatever the secret of the dereliction, the "Eloi" of Christ on the cross is the most tragic cry of human history. At this point the crucifixion means that Christ plumbed the depths of human woe. "And some of them that stood by, when they heard it, said, Behold, this man calleth Elijah." "There came one moment, bitterest of all."

The cross meant to Christ the finishing of His mission on earth. Hitherto for six hours, without anesthetic, He had faced death with undimmed consciousness, enduring the agonizing thirst of the mortally wounded. He thirsted; He received the vinegar, and said: "It is finished." The work was done; the cup was drained to its last bitter dregs; the Father's will was accomplished. He had seen of the travail of His

soul and was satisfied. The storm was over, and in the eventime there was light.

“And when Jesus had cried again with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit. And having said this, he bowed his head and yielded up his spirit.”

The two thieves survived. The coming Sabbath was a high day; its preparation began at six o'clock. The death of those crucified must be hastened, that their bodies remain not on the cross upon the Sabbath. So the soldiers, with Pilate's permission, broke their legs. “But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs; howbeit, one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and straightway there came out blood and water.” Some have surmised that His death before the others was due, not to His physical tortures only, though these were adequate in themselves, but literally to a broken heart, whence came the blood and water. Whatever the immediate cause, the cross meant to Christ paying the full price, at awful cost, and finishing His work, at thirty-three.

And through these momentous things that the cross meant to Christ the tree of shame has become the symbol of glorified suffering and victorious life.

The most popular devotional book in the world, after the Bible, is the *Imitation of Christ*, by Thomas á Kempis. Perhaps assimilation would be a better word than “imitation.” The Christian repeats the experiences of Christ. He takes up his cross daily. He subjects his lower to his higher nature. He does not retaliate. He suffers at the sin of the world. He is baptized with the baptism of Christ. He seeks not to crucify the Lord afresh, but to be himself crucified with Christ. (St. Paul prayed that he might have

“the fellowship of his suffering.”) Since the tragedy on Golgotha’s mound, the principle of the cross has become permanent in human experience, leading men on to walk in newness of life.

From Bethlehem to Calvary the world still follows on,
Even as the halt and blind of old along His path were drawn;
Through Calvary’s clouds they seek the light that led Him to
the dawn.

THE ALIENATION OF THE LATIN-AMERICAN MIND FROM CHRISTIANITY

By VICTOR ANDRES BELAUNDE, Professor of Philosophy, University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru; Editor, *Mercurio Peruano*

THE first question in dealing with this subject is to ask whether the Latin-American mind is really far away from Christianity. When Lord Bryce visited South America he made the observation that we lacked intellectual atmosphere and religious feeling. I believe that there was a certain exaggeration in this statement. The Latin-American countries as a whole are not so religious as the British or American. There is no doubt about this. I do not think that we are less religious than the French, German or Italian people.

Everybody agrees that religious feeling is very powerful among women. Many think that this religious feeling is rather superficial and given to external manifestations, and that therefore it cannot be considered as proof of a high standard of our religious character. I cannot deny that women in South America are much devoted to ceremonies and liturgy, but at the same time I ought to remark that the religious feeling of our women has a deep-rooted moral foundation; it is not only material and external; it is derived from a high moral point of view. We have proof of this in the organization of the Latin-American family, in the devotion of the mothers to their children, and chiefly in the conception that love is sacrifice and life is principally duty. The hedonistic conception of life is not as predominant among the women as it is

among the men. In many towns, chiefly in the old towns of the countries that have preserved the Spanish tradition, marriage, for women, represents the renunciation of all the pleasures and luxuries of life, and entire devotion to the home and to the education of the children. Yet things are changing. It is not possible to go into details, but nevertheless there exist in South America wonderful examples of ideal homes and ideal mothers, sisters, and daughters.

The picture is different indeed regarding our men. If as a rule women are religious in South America, men are indifferent, especially among the educated class. And this religious indifference gave to Lord Bryce the impression of a lack of religious feeling. It is necessary to discriminate in order to be accurate.

First, we may note the lowest class, in which religious feeling in the form of primitive superstitions is very strong. I include in this group the native races in which Catholicism is rather the cover under which we find fetichism.

The second group is composed of the workers of the towns who belong chiefly to the mixed class. Some years ago the workers of the lowest class of the cities were deeply religious, but now, on account of the socialistic propaganda, the materialistic conception of life is spreading rapidly. It is difficult to find all religious types among the proletariat under the influence of socialistic leaders. There are some groups of Catholic workers, but the number of these is not considerable in comparison with the workers who are indifferent or radical in religious matters.

The third group is composed of people of the middle class, chiefly the intellectual class. This element is the more influential, not only through their culture,

but also through their numbers. Liberalism and radicalism in politics as a rule have been accompanied by agnosticism or atheism in religion, and have recruited membership from the intellectual youth of the middle class in all the countries of Latin-America.

To complete this rather superficial survey I may add the well-to-do people that are generally conservative in both politics and religion. But the religion of this group does not represent a real force, being rather what Anatole France called the "elegant form of religious indifference."

Summing up these remarks, we may say that, putting aside the primitive religious instincts of the lowest stratum and the not very valuable religious feeling of the upper class, we have the socialistic workers and the intellectual radical middle class in South America really alienated from the Christian faith.

Let me explain first how the intellectual youth of the different periods of our history became irreligious. In spite of the Christianization of the New World after the conquest and the exalted Catholicism of our colonial times, at the end of the eighteenth century the philosophy of the enlightenment, with its hedonistic morals, arrived in the New World. Nothing is more opposed to the essentials of Christian faith than the vague deism of the French thought, and deists were the principal leaders of Latin-America on the eve of independence. In all the countries of Latin-America the advanced ideas of the leaders of the revolutionary period made a compromise with the Catholic feelings of the bulk of the people. But this compromise left alive the irreligious ferment, and very soon in many countries, chiefly Mexico and Columbia, this struggle

between the liberals and the Catholics, or conservatives, began in rather a tragic way.

The Catholic reaction in France and Spain, backed by the romantic movement in literature, arrived in Latin-America, but did not extinguish the radical or anti-religious element. And very soon many romantics, as in France, adopted liberalism and joined the element against the Church.

We are touching now the real point of the religious question in South America. Because of the attitude of the Church, which always was a political power, the liberal element was bound to be radical in religion. In this clear-cut struggle between the rival elements there was small room for tolerance and open-mindedness. In the countries above referred to, which are typical examples, it was impossible to be simply liberal or Christian. The supporters of the autocratic rule and the principle of authority in politics were the very supporters of the influence of the Church. On the other hand, the leaders of the democratic movement would combat the Church as a backward institution and as an enemy of civilization. The struggle was less acute in other countries, as in Peru or Chile, but even in these the fields were well defined. At this time it was necessary to be either red or black—no room for the golden medium. Is the Church only to be blamed for this fact? It would be unjust to charge her with exclusive responsibility. Doubtless, she has her share, but we cannot neglect the psychological factors and the intolerant temper of the other side.

In the middle of the nineteenth century in all the countries of Latin-America this struggle between liberals and conservatives was general, and everywhere the liberal propaganda, with very few exceptions, was

coupled with anti-religious thought. The new currents in philosophy as spread through universities and colleges came to add a new force to this contest. After the philosophy of enlightenment with its materialistic tendencies, the eclectic philosophy was paramount in Latin-America, and Cousin was the idol. But very soon a new teaching came to attract the attention of the young people. The positivistic philosophy, although compatible with some conservative principles in politics, came to strengthen the people that antagonized the Catholic Church.

The influence of the positivistic school is well known in Latin-America. The religion of mankind has its principal followers in Brazil, where it has a temple. The Mexican intellectual was also strongly positivistic. As Cousin was the idol of the old generation, Comte became the idol of the new. At the same time the works of Spencer, with their easy and comprehensible style, were read in the universities and colleges, arousing an admiration that the true philosophical mind can understand to-day.

I do not hesitate to say that the positivistic influence, in spite of the mystical spirit of Comte and the respect for the unknowable of Spencer, was a factor that helped to alienate the South American mind from Christianity. Perhaps due to the tendency of the Latin-American intellect to draw extreme conclusions and to exaggerate ideas, the positivistic tendencies were nearer to the materialistic school than to the moderate position taken by the founders of positivism. Positivism was interpreted in a very wrong way. Almost all the so-called positivists were not merely agnostics but atheists. Instead of the dogmatism of religion we have had the dogmatism of science, the real

liberal and Christian mind being excluded. Besides the positivistic spirit, the radical tendency manifested itself in powerful literature. It spread the new ideas in a very impressive way, and political ideas were linked with certain conceptions of life and of nature, taking, on the opposite side, the same attitude as Catholicism. It is not necessary to mention many examples. It will be enough to remember the writings of Gonzales Prada, in Peru, to understand how impossible in such conditions was the growth and development of a state of mind that would accept, at the same time, the Christian principles and the progress of science.

I wish to speak especially of institutions that I know personally. I mean the universities. Not only among the members of the faculties but also among the students, extremely rare were the cases of religious feeling without any connection with the dogmatic attitude of the Catholic Church. The great majority of the professors and students were either indifferent, or else dogmatic radicals or positivists. We lacked the sense of *nuance*, and in this condition religion as the free expression of the feeling of the soul was impossible. Religion was chiefly dogma and hierarchy, cult and authority. On the other side, science was not tolerance and continuous process, but formulas and inflexible laws. The same rigidity we can find in politics, religion and politics being thoroughly intermingled.

The described state of mind lasted until the arrival of the neo-idealistic tendencies. The new philosophy, maintaining that the highest values of life cannot be given by science, but are the ground of religion, and affirming again the spiritual side of our nature and the reality of liberty, broke the bonds and freed the mind of the young people, creating a new intellectual atmos-

phere. The spread of idealistic philosophy is recent in South America. It dates only from twenty-five years ago, and is still contending with the remnants of the forces of positivistic and radical thought. Real Christian feeling can be aroused again among the young people apart from the influence of the Catholic Church. It is true that many of the neo-idealists are going to join the Catholic forces, but at the same time the bulk of the adherents of the new philosophical tendencies will be nothing more than simply Christian.

New economic theories and problems have, and will have, in South America, much more influence than the pure philosophical doctrines, and the religious feelings suffer from the influence of these ideas much more than from that of philosophical principles. To a certain extent the philosophical influence favorable to Christianity is limited to-day to the *elite*, or selected class. Of course, the majority of the people, composed of the lower middle class, the wage earners, are far away from the direct influence of philosophical tendencies, but they are in touch with the powerful propaganda of the new economic programs. The early socialistic tendencies, chiefly those connected with the romantic movement, were not opposed to Christianity, and the Christian churches, even the Catholic Church, adopted towards socialism a sympathetic attitude, and there was a Christian socialism and a Catholic socialism. But now the socialistic principles carrying a materialistic conception of history and of life demand that men put aside Christian feeling and the religious beliefs. From the communistic viewpoint, religion is the "opium of the people," and it is necessary to assert the existence of this world only and to get happiness in this life. Socialism, in this exaggerated and extreme form, is a

new force in Latin-America that will check the good influence of the idealistic philosophy, and will revive, with the great strength of economic theories, the old factors against religion that came down from the philosophy of the eighteenth century, the radicalism and the positivism of the nineteenth century.

The Latin-American mind, so apt to accept and to exaggerate all deductions, runs the risk of a quick spread of the communistic conception of life and of communistic political tendencies. The reaction against this movement will take the form of a dogmatic reaction in behalf of the Catholic Church and extremely conservative ideals and principles. We are witnessing even now, not on account of the mere political principles as in the middle of the nineteenth century, but on account of the more important economic doctrines, a struggle that is going to take a more serious character and to have far-reaching consequences. The intellectuals could be free Christians and liberals or evolutionary socialists; the crowd is bound to belong either to the clerical party or the communistic party.

When I was in Montevideo and Buenos Aires I could see the early manifestations of this struggle. For many weeks the socialistic party had control of the town of Buenos Aires. Some months later the White Guard was organized, and Catholic processions took place in Buenos Aires and Montevideo with unusual display of solemnity and attended by unsurpassed numbers. When I spoke of this with a certain Argentine philosopher, he made this observation, which I cannot forget: The only forces that can put one hundred thousand men in the streets of Buenos Aires are the Catholic Church and the Socialistic Party. According

to information that I have, something similar is happening in Chile and probably will happen in Peru.

Regarding Mexico, it is not necessary to say that in no country of Latin-America have the communistic principles more favorable ground. When I attended the fourth Students' Congress in Mexico I observed that the youth of that country, as well as the youth of the other countries represented in the congress, accepted enthusiastically the communistic creed. Henry Barbuse was the author who inspired the ideals of these young men. I have observed the warmth with which they have spoken about the Russian revolution and the speeches of Lenin. The dogmatic mind appears to me as strong and as dangerous in this direction as the dogmatic mind from the conservative point of view.

I may say, in closing this review, that the great enemy of the Christian faith in Latin-America in the future will be the communistic propaganda, and the preaching of the idea that happiness can be obtained in this world and is the only aim.

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

THERE IS AN EVER INCREASING DEMAND FOR A SIMPLE CHRISTIAN creed. Yet a formal statement of belief must not be so brief as to leave out some vital point, for in the end this is unsatisfactory and controversy is invited. The problem is, to formulate a statement of the evangelical faith comprehensive enough to include every essential element of that faith, but without including points upon which true Christians differ.

It is hardly probable that the Apostle's Creed can be greatly improved upon. Any attempt to amplify it would almost certainly involve some affirmation which many would not be willing to accept, while it could not be simplified and still retain all that the general consensus of Protestantism demands as the basis of Christian fellowship.

But, after all, no formal creed can adequately express Christianity. For its life and power are bound up as truly in its implications as in its affirmations. To declare one's belief in his divine Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, as presented in the Gospels, is necessary to a confession of faith, but it means little for the believer who does not concern himself with the kind of life that such a confession implies and demands. On the other hand, if one would consistently carry out all that is implied in such a belief in Christ, he would soon find himself possessed of a creed. For he would be impelled to know more about his Lord, and so would be driven to the Scriptures, whose study would reveal the other objects of faith and all needed principles of conduct. In other words, if one is rightly related to Jesus Christ, the details of his faith will fill themselves in.

A short time ago *The British Weekly* contained an edi-

torial upon this question of a simpler creed, and these paragraphs might well help many a soul to find his way out of theological confusion:

"It may be necessary occasionally not only to listen to this demand for simplification but even to support or stimulate it. For there is a relentless tendency towards complexity in the scheme of things—a tendency which may need to be resisted and counteracted. The evolution of life is an ordered progress from the simple to the complex. The story of civilization is largely the story of organization—the superimposing of complexity upon simplicity. It is small wonder, then, that religion, that Christianity itself, should develop in the same direction. Yet sometimes amid doctrinal complexities, ritual complexities, ecclesiastical complexities, men remember the sweet and clear beginnings of the Galilean Gospel, and they ask that faith should once more be made plain and simple.

"The request deserves an answer, and the answer ought to be partly warning and partly encouragement.

"There is room for a word of caution here. It is well to make the message simple, but not well to give the impression that everything can be made simple, or that a complete scheme of thought and life can be provided in words of one syllable. To think that truth can always be made simple is one of our intellectual temptations. As a matter of experience it is not so. What is the cure for cancer? There is no simple and obvious remedy waiting. What is the solution of our social distress? No cut-and-dried formula will charm our darkness into day. These things take hard thinking, long investigation, the best endeavors of the best minds; and, even so, we are only travelling, we have not arrived. The same elusiveness of truth besets us everywhere: the smallest fact of science or of life, if we only look at it closely enough, becomes itself a mystery, and lies on the edge of abysses too deep for our sounding. Why do men so persistently imagine that, while strenuous thinking is needed in every other department of knowledge, religion, which deals with the summed-up meaning of all things, can dispense with the travail of the mind?

"Yet the plea for a simple faith may be met with a great and positive encouragement. We are encompassed with problems at every step, not in the religious realm alone, yet most of our problems have a practical end, and if we take hold of them there they do not altogether bar our progress. Many

people are learning to 'listen-in' who could tell us little about wave-lengths or wireless mechanism—their experience is the justification of an experiment which they could not explain. And many souls who could not state to their own satisfaction the doctrine of the Trinity nor give a philosophical defense of it to the world, have gazed upon Jesus Christ until they are sure that in Him the glory of the Divine and Eternal is risen upon them.

"It is instructive in this connection to study the lives of God's saints, and notice how commonly they lived upon the simplest things: it was these that made them the men they were, not the curious controversies and side issues in which they sometimes found themselves entangled. Richard Baxter tells in the *Reliquiae* how in his earlier days he was very fond of curiosities and subtleties—the mere twigs upon the tree of truth, he calls them. By and by, being older and wiser, he came in to the central stock of the tree: such things as the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, gave him most acceptable and plentiful matter for all his meditations. In this he might have spoken for many of the wisest and the greatest."

NOW AND THEN SOME WORD ACQUIRES SUCH A NEW SIGNIFICANCE that one must be careful how he uses it. Fundamental is such a one. It has to be handled with caution just at present, or it is liable to produce an explosion. Nevertheless, some things are fundamental, some are not, and the word will stay in the English language because this fact makes it necessary. With characteristic directness and vigor Col. E. W. Halford has borne his testimony, in *Association Men*, to *The Only One Fundamental*, and its burden is expressed in this single paragraph:

"Creeds and statements of faith, valuable as they may be, are not fundamental. They cannot be made so by someone calling them such, however volubly or repetitiously. Creeds are man-made; necessarily subject to change in form and statement to render them from time to time expressive of a vital Christ to vital men. No creed formulated by Pope or Council; no confession of faith, whether from Augsburg or Westminster; no Articles of Belief—whether 39 or 25, prescribed

by General Conventions, General Assemblies or General Conferences, whether uttered thirteen, or thirteen hundred years ago, can bar men of sound mind from the continuous search for God as He is, and will always be, revealed in the living Christ. The one only 'fundamental' test is the spiritual attitude of every man and of every organization toward 'Jesus Christ as God and Saviour.' "

FUNDAMENTALISM IS NOT AT PRESENT A SHARPLY DEFINED term, for the Fundamentalists are not fully agreed among themselves on all points. Still, taken broadly, it stands for the opposite of rationalism, liberalism, and modernism. It means orthodoxy as opposed to heterodoxy, the support of the common evangelical articles of the Christian faith as against the religious vagaries of the times. It looks to the Scriptures as its source of belief, not to human reason.

The interest in the present theological conflict is not confined to the church. The struggle is furnishing features for the newspapers, and the magazines are not ignoring it. The *World's Work* has regarded the matter of sufficient importance to engage an experienced writer, Mr. Rollin Lynde Hartt, to study the situation throughout the country and write a series of articles upon his observations. He has traveled some three thousand miles, interviewed prominent conservatives and liberals, and visited numerous institutions and churches. In the September issue of that monthly he deals in a most informing and graphic way with *The War in the Churches*.

One of the most striking facts he brings out is, that the Christian public is overwhelmingly inclined toward the conservative side. "Dr. Shailer Matthews," says Mr. Hartt, "sitting at President Harper's old desk in the divinity school of the University of Chicago, told me that the Fundamentalists now control about a quarter of the evangelical churches in the East, about half the evangelical churches in the Middle West and South, and about three-quarters of the evangelical churches in the Far West." Incidentally, the reasons for these geographical differences might afford a valuable study.

From the evidence Mr. Hartt offers it can hardly be denied that multitudes, possibly millions, are eagerly and sympathetically following what is being spoken and written upon Fundamentalism and Premillennialism. After showing how popular these themes are, he continues:

“Do the liberals know this? Evidently the liberals do not. The other evening, in an apartment looking out across the Gothic quadrangle of a famous theological seminary, a distinguished liberal spoke of Fundamentalism as at once a lost cause and a tribute to the strength of liberalism. ‘We are winning,’ he said, and so it appears—to dwellers in apartments looking out across the Gothic quadrangle of famous theological seminaries. They have won the colleges—mainly. They have won the divinity schools—largely. They have won the educated ministers—partly. In church councils attended by an elite, they generally triumph. They lead many leaders; but the great mass of the people—where are they? What the liberals disregard is the huge and long-exerted influence of aged clergymen, of Princeton Seminary and its orthodox congeners, of the *Sunday School Times*, of prophetic conferences, of tracts, of cartooning, of the book [Jesus is Coming] now in its two-hundred-and-sixtieth thousand, of Billy Sunday, of the Northfield gatherings, of Bible Institutes (entrance requirement, ‘a common school education, or its equivalent’), and of a pietism which, though supposedly moribund, has crusaded against evolution in seven states, terrorized numerous universities, inspired a nation-wide uprising against modernism, and made William Jennings Bryan the most influential preacher on earth, for so he is.”

One of most pertinent questions raised is that of the effect of the Fundamentalist movement upon the church—whether the conservatives will leave it, or the liberals, and with what result in the matter of ecclesiastical organization. As to the proper course for the liberals Mr. Hartt quotes freely from Professor Machen, of Princeton Seminary, author of *Christianity and Liberalism*, and says, after giving the opinion of another on this point:

“With equal earnestness Professor Machen writes, ‘A

separation between the two parties in the church is the crying need of the hour.'

"It is not the conservatives who should withdraw, he contends, and the reason, he tells us, 'is found in the trust which the churches hold. That trust includes trust funds of the most definite kind. And contrary to what seems to be the prevailing opinion, we venture to regard a trust as a sacred thing. The funds of the evangelical churches are held under a very definite trust; they are committed to the various bodies for the propagation of the gospel as set forth in the Bible and in the confessions of faith. To devote them to any other purpose, even though that other purpose should be in itself far more desirable, would be a violation of trust.'

"The proper course of action, he goes on to say, 'is perfectly open to the man who desires to propagate "liberal Christianity." Finding the existing evangelical churches to be bound up to a creed which he does not accept, he may either unite himself with some other existing body or else found a new body to suit himself.' That there are 'certain obvious disadvantages in such a course,' Professor Machen admits; it would involve 'the abandonment of church buildings,' a 'break in family traditions,' an 'injury to sentiment of various kinds.' Moreover, 'by withdrawing from the confessional churches—those churches which are founded upon a creed derived from Scripture—the liberal preacher would indeed sacrifice the opportunity, almost within his grasp, of so obtaining control of those confessional churches as to change their fundamental character. The sacrifice of that opportunity would mean that the hope of turning the resources of the evangelical churches into Liberalism would be gone.' But the Professor hastens to console the liberal by pointing out 'one supreme advantage' which 'far overbalances all such disadvantages.'

"This, he asserts, is 'the advantage of honesty.' Though 'the path of honesty in such matters may be rough and thorny, it can be trod.' Indeed, 'it has already been trod—for example, by the Unitarian Church.' Says Machen, 'The Unitarian Church is frankly and honestly just the kind of church that the liberal preacher desires—namely, a church without an authoritative Bible, without doctrinal requirements, and without a creed.'"

THE WORLD HAS SELDOM IF EVER BEEN CLOSER TO HOPELESSNESS than now. Different temperaments react in their several ways.

Some are indifferent, some cloud their minds with all sorts of forebodings, some turn more closely to business, and many pursue pleasure with an abandon that suggests their incapacity to think of anything else worth while. The world seems to have adopted as its motto: "Let us eat, drink and be merry, for to-morrow we die." It is useless to seek any single cause for this state of affairs, but that type of preaching that has largely discarded the central theme and message of the New Testament has not helped matters any.

Now, whenever men find themselves in a desperate situation, nothing so preserves hope and courage as the presence of a commanding personality. Human nature is so made. For this reason the church alone holds the solution of the world's question at this hour. In an address upon the necessity of Christ, before the Northfield Young Women's Conference the past summer, Dr. John McDowell closed with these words, reported in the *Record of Christian Work*:

"Hope that is born of science and natural evidence awakens no joyful enthusiasm in the masses of mankind. It stands with a question upon its lips, tremulous at times, peering into the future with a troubled gaze, hoping rather than believing, and passing into the future with the peace of resignation rather than the joy of assurance. Christian hope—that is, hope that is born of trust in the person of Christ and belief in the promises of Christ,—voices itself in words of assurance such as these, 'We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens' (2 Corinthians 5:1). In words of triumph, 'I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord' (Romans 8:38-39). In words of victory (1 Corinthians 15:57). In words of comfort (John 14:1-3). In words of peace, 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth give I unto you: let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid' (John 14:27).

"What Christianity offers to men is not life, or truth, or

growth, or service, or fellowship, or hope, apart from Christ, but Christ himself. A man apart from Christ cannot be a Christian. He loses Christianity as absolutely as a hand would lose its use and its meaning if it were cut off from the body.

"The acknowledgment that Christ is Christianity is bound up with New Testament Christianity. Take away this conception of Christianity, and you may have life left, but not Christian life. You may have truth left, but not Christian truth. You may have growth left, but not Christian growth. You may have service left, but not Christian service. You may have fellowship left, but not Christian fellowship. You may have hope left, but not Christian hope. Christian history and Christian experience affirm that Jesus Christ is a necessity if we are to have the Christianity of the New Testament, the Christianity that can and will save the world."

THE CALL FOR POSITIVE UTTERANCE WAS NEVER SO STRONG. Everybody is tired of questions and doubts. The demand is for what is actually worth believing and doing. Somehow it gives a better impression of red-blooded virility to answer the question, "What must I do to be saved?" than, What can I avoid believing and doing, and still not be lost? General Leonard Wood is credited with a call for help for the Far East that illustrates the importance of having something definite to offer:

"You can write to your people and your religious papers and tell them to send the best they have to these Far Eastern mission fields. These people need a positive faith from a positive man. They have doubts enough; they do not need to be fed any more! If a missionary is uncertain in his faith, they will be the first to know it and turn away in disappointment, or else be led astray—which is worse. If Kipling could say, concerning 'The White Man's Burden,' in regard to mere physical responsibility for these weaker Eastern races, 'Send forth the best ye breed!' we surely ought to be able to say it, and demand it, for the spiritual needs of these same people. We need 'the best ye breed' for this work out here, and the natives need that same kind, or the work will fail."

THE IMPRESSIONS OF FOREIGNERS ARE ALWAYS INTERESTING, AND often diverting. But when a thoughtful observer from foreign

shores makes a serious and considered comment upon any side of American life, his opinions frequently have real value. Not long ago a foreigner, under the nom de plume "Tixe Tuo," contributed to the Boston Transcript a very frank criticism of our churches and the preaching heard in them. He seems to have been unfortunate in the churches he visited, and so judged our general ecclesiastical standards somewhat harshly, but these two excerpts at least deserve attention:

"I must confess that I have found it a difficult matter in the American churches at times to see the cross of Christ for the Stars and Stripes. Whether the churches recognize this or not a stranger attending many of the church services will gather this impression that the churches have been captured by the State ideal.

"As I read my New Testament it seems to me that Jesus insisted on certain fundamental principles. He placed first of all sorrow for sin, and then a forsaking of sin. He demanded love for God, and, after that, service for man as a result of our love for God. But the chief fundamental, if I may use that term, is sorrow for sin. It comes somewhat in the nature of a shock to find that there is a tendency, in the churches at all events I have attended in America, for them to put the emphasis on service for man. Indeed in the services for public worship I have heard little or nothing about the great fundamental principle enunciated by Jesus. I take nine services at random from my notebook, and I find that in only one case was the soul made to feel its need of pardon: simply and plainly without any denunciation on the part of the preacher, the soul was made to feel its unworthiness, its need of God and then, cleansed and pardoned, desired to express an adoring love in service."

IT IS SAID THAT SELDOM IS A GREAT ORATOR A GREAT THINKER. His eloquence is cultivated at the expense of his judicial powers. He seeks to make a strong impression more than to impart instruction. Often the impression is so strong that the speaker is the first victim of his own unconscious distortion of the truth. It is no doubt true that many facile platform men are so habitually beguiled by their ability to speak

eloquently that their capacity to speak accurately has atrophied, and they always at least seem to be insincere, whether they believe their own words or not. As Dr. L. P. Jacks has said, in an article in *The Star*:

"It is the tragedy of religion that in the speaking part of it—for it has a speaking part—eloquence has been cultivated and sincerity overlooked. Had not the Christian religion been essentially divine and immortal, eloquence, divorced from sincerity, would have killed it long ago.

"It is the vice of all eloquent persons to deceive themselves into thinking they believe a thing simply because they are able to work it up into fine speech of one kind or another. They become confused in consequence between what they believe themselves and what they can exhibit, by eloquence, as believable. This confusion naturally leads to the loss of sincerity and has done untold harm to the Christian religion.

"The limit of the mischief is reached when men grow eloquent, or even argumentative, in defending their right to say they believe something which by their own confession they don't really believe.

"Had speakers of Christianity been sufficiently on their guard against the dangers of the tongue, and confined themselves to what they really believed, thousands of eloquent sermons would never have been preached, and hundreds of learned books would never have been written, but civilization would not be the un-Christian thing it is today."

THE PERSISTENCE OF CRITICISMS OF PREACHERS WHO WANDER from the great messages of Christianity would indicate that there is a widespread feeling of rebellion among churchgoers who, Sunday after Sunday, are given discussions of secular and semi-secular topics. The popular lecture from the pulpit is in a fair way to become quite unpopular. In considering *The Preacher's Primary Aim*, *The Watchman-Examiner* said, among other things, a short time ago:

"It is an imposition, an impertinence, to make a rostrum of the pulpit for the discussion of the passing topics of the day. We do not say, as some have hastily said, that ministers are not well enough informed to speak intelligently on current topics, but we do say that the pulpit is not the place, nor the

Lord's Day the time, for the discussion of them. 'Do you know whom I go to hear when I go to church?' said a prominent Brooklyn lawyer several years ago. 'I go to hear good Dr. Cuyler' (Dr. Cuyler was still pastor of the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church), 'for I always hear the gospel from him. I hear enough of politics and public questions during the week,' he added, 'and probably know as much about them as the average preacher.' 'I thank you from my heart,' said another eminent lawyer to a minister who had just preached to the guests of a large summer hotel where the lawyer was staying. The discourse was on 'Christ the Saviour,' and was, as the preacher characterized it, a very simple one. 'Yes,' replied the lawyer, 'but it is just that simple gospel that all men need, and they will never cease to need it.'

"We believe that that expresses the thought and desire of thousands of men and women in our congregations who are hungering for the Bread of Life."

WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO SELECT A SERMON TEXT? THIS question can be answered from different angles; the occasion, the audience, some experience the community is passing through, or the interest of the preacher in a particular passage, may decide the question. But it is probable that most preachers have an impersonal interest in the text selected. They are concerned to interpret and apply it with the congregation in mind, just as a teacher conducts a recitation by her young class. Her own relation to the subject is of no special interest. But here is the way a great preacher, Dr. Alexander Whyte, viewed the choice of texts, as given in a bit of autobiography that has appeared in *The British Weekly*:

"When—as Coleridge says about himself—when any Scripture 'found' me, when the Holy Spirit said to me, 'Thou art the man,' I immediately accepted the condemnation or the comfort, as the case might be. I came more and more to read Holy Scripture, not with a 'lust' for pulpit texts, as Spurgeon says, but with an eye for myself and for my own salvation. A class-fellow of mine, after he had been settled for a year or so, came and said to me: 'How are you getting on with your preaching—for I have quite run through all my pulpit texts?' I said to him something like this: 'If you were as bad a man

as I am, if you had as bad a heart as I have, and if you were beset before and behind with temptations and crosses and snares like mine, then texts, and the best texts for the best sermons, would crowd in upon you continually.' And, sir, in saying that to my friend I said nothing but the experimental truth; for to this day I never conduct family worship and I never read a chapter to myself alone that text after text do not leap out upon me as if they had all been written expressly and exclusively for me. And I never cast such special and personal texts behind my back; no, never once. I select the most home-coming of those texts, and I write upon it every forenoon, even though I have nowadays no pulpit use for what I write—no pulpit use, only my own paramount and pressing use."

ONE OF THE DISADVANTAGES OF AN ABUNDANCE OF READING matter is that it tends to purposeless reading. The number of new books upon subjects that are worth while is simply appalling. But the number of books that are worth while is not so impressive. Still there are enough to bewilder one who wants to carry on his reading to the best advantage. One solution is, to determine upon a definite theme for reading and to confine oneself chiefly to books that deal with it, with sufficient attention to periodical literature and an occasional book on other lines to keep generally informed. The point is, concentration upon a definite object. The Lutheran has made a suggestion to ministers that may well be taken to heart by laymen:

"One of the faults of some ministers is that they do too much promiscuous reading and hence read to little purpose. Their reading is but another name for literary dissipation. Light reading, such as the best fiction, is not to be despised; but unless there is select reading, the reading of books that enrich both the heart and the mind, the minister will not add much to his power as a preacher. It is better to read a few choice books that are worthy to be digested than to skim over the surface of many books and suffer from literary indigestion. It was the well-known Dr. Nevin of the Reformed Church who once said: 'When I was younger I had an ambition to be the possessor of a large library; but the older I grow, the more I

am convinced that a limited number of choice books, with the Bible as the chief among them all, is much better for a minister by far.' What has become a glaring fault in our system of education where the cramming process is in full swing is no less a fault among readers in this day of great libraries. There is too much reading and too little digesting."

THE SOUL IS QUITE SENSITIVE TO THINGS IT MAY NOT BE ABLE to define or describe. Men say of a public utterance, a book, a picture, a piece of music, that it has "an indefinable quality," or that it "lacks something." This is often true of sermons. One man's pulpit deliverance holds the attention and moves the heart, yet the average hearer may be puzzled to determine with any certainty just where its power lies. Or he misses some quality, but cannot say what element is lacking that would give it interest and force. Here are two small quotations that suggest two factors whose lack has spoiled the treatment of many a great text. The first is taken from the Record of Christian Work, the second is credited to Dr. James Hastings:

"A minister preached on 1 Corinthians 13:1. The reporter for the daily paper got it right, but the linotype operator, in setting the word 'charity,' made the mistake of using an 'l' instead of an 'h,' and the proofreader overlooked it. So the minister was reported in the morning paper as having preached from the following text:

"'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not clarity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.'

"Commenting on the story the editor says:

"'As it appears in print it was not New Testament truth, but it was truth, nevertheless. The people want the preacher to be luminous rather than voluminous, and the preacher who is without clarity will soon be without a congregation. So, whether we like it or not, such are the conditions which confront us in these busy days with their many duties. And we must either meet the conditions of our own generation, or fail to serve it.'"

"There are two kinds of sermons that are bad. There is the sermon that has nothing of the preacher's personality in it, and there is the sermon that has nothing else. Without the

preacher's personality, which gives life, the sermon will be a failure. But there must be something in the sermon for his personality to work on. If present-day preaching is as insipid and ineffectual as it is said to be, it is due more to the thinness of the thought and the weakness of the wording than to the absence of the preacher's personality."

YES, REFORMERS ARE NUMEROUS. THEIR INDIVIDUAL VOICES can hardly be distinguished in the general clamor for better ways of doing things. No doubt every cause represented is important, but it is respectfully moved that, if not altogether out of order, the floor be given for a moment to the man who has a consuming desire to remake, replace, or somehow improve the conventional "order of service" in our regular church worship.

Leaving the feelings of those in the pews entirely out of account, something ought to be said for the preacher who comes into the pulpit with a message, but has to wait nearly an hour before he can deliver it. If he could devote this time to final quiet meditation it might not be so bad, but he has to spend it acting as a sort of master of ceremonies, under more or less strain lest some slip occur to mar the dignity of the service. Then some of his hearers wonder why his sermon seems to fail.

The "order of service" in some churches has gone beyond reason and almost beyond endurance. It has come to be a combination of religious ritual and local church publicity. Who has not heard a string of announcements as long as a sermonette? How is it possible for any one short of a platform genius to expound the Scriptures effectively after all this? The *Christian Herald* reflects the perplexity of one noted preacher under such conditions:

"Dr. Charles M. Sheldon finds himself often on a Sunday in a church facing an 'Order of Service' which he has come to dread on account of its 'Preliminaries.'

"As, for example, an average church service arranged as follows:

“Organ Prelude. Doxology. Invocation. Response. Solo. Responsive Reading. Anthem. Hymn. Duet. Scripture. Prayer. Response. Second Anthem. Notices. (Solo) Offering. Offertory Prayer. Gloria. Hymn. Sermon. Hymn. Benediction. Organ Postlude.

“Looking over this ‘Order of Service’ Dr. Sheldon rather anxiously begins to count the minutes absorbed by the ‘preliminaries.’ The hour hand of the clock on the front of the gallery facing the pulpit moves around to eleven-fifty before the item of the ‘Sermon’ is reached. And as he rises to give his message he realizes that he is facing a tired audience, breathing bad air, in poor condition of mind or body to receive inspiration.

“This is not an unreasonable or egotistic demand for the putting forward of the sermon. There is a fitting place for the organ and the choir and the rest of the Order of Service. But a great many speakers are being submerged by ‘Orders of Service.’ The Sermon is away at the bottom of the long list of ‘Responses’ and ‘Solos’ and ‘Organ’ and ‘Notices.’

“If no other epitaph is handy when the editor of the Christian Herald dies, please write this on his tombstone. It sometimes seems as if it might be appropriate, and more or less (like all epitaphs) true:

“‘Here lies the man who thought he had a sermon to preach. He longed to preach it, but he was killed by the ‘Preliminaries!’”

IT IS ENCOURAGING TO NOTE THE DEMAND FOR VITAL, DETERMINING religion in all walks of life. We need men in business, in the professions, in shops, in stores, on the farms, on the sea—everywhere, who have a profound conviction that they are called to witness for their Lord where they are. Life is incomplete, ill-controlled, selfish, hopeless, even dangerous, without the motive of godliness. Nothing so bears witness to this fact as a consistent Christian life that manifests the opposite of these weaknesses. Religion is not an effeminate thing. A cringing, man-fearing spirit does not live in the same heart with loyalty to Jesus Christ. Your real Christian has moral independence and moral force. This is brought out in a por-

tion of Chancellor Charles W. Flint's address to the graduating class this year at Syracuse University:

"Our University Appointments Bureaus have had an embarrassing demand this year from the economic world for recruits to fill vacancies and expand the service. We have had insistent calls to aid replacement and extension in the social world, but unquestionably the greatest specific need of the world as you enter it is for vital religion and spiritual leadership in all professions and occupations. Of late, leaders in the economic world, like Babson and Gary and the more serious labor leaders, have vocalized this fundamental need of the hour. Specialists in social engineering see civilization perishing for lack of it: spiritual dynamic, vital religion and saving idealism. Can you meet the demand? Are you equipped? Will you serve?

"Patriotism accentuates the demand. We are suffering in public life from wishywashyness and worse, from lack of significance, from total eclipse of positiveness of conviction, from a pitiful dearth of sincerity and lack of moral earnestness. God knows how badly we need in our State and nation, yea, in the ensmallled and omni-contiguous world, for our economic salvation, for our social salvation, for the salvation of national character, for even the salvage of civilization, men of real leadership, significant, positive, decisive, determined, furnishing convictions and conscience to the masses, instead of pandering to their prejudices and catering to their weaknesses—men who will stand squarely, puissantly and achievingly for things worth standing for, living for or dying for—men more willing to suffer defeat with principles and ideals than to attain or retain power with weak compromise.

"The public will respond: its nobleness, sleeping but never dead, will rise in majesty to meet the nobleness of a real man. It yearns for the chance. It is tired of pussyfooting politicians and weather-vane policies. It is eager for a leader. It is eager to follow, eager for someone to deny it its own desires, eager for someone to scourge it for its vagaries, eager for someone to check it in its lawlessness, eager to be led."

IN THESE DAYS IT TAKES A YOUNG MAN SO LONG TO ACQUIRE thorough preparation for a profession that the old-time broad, cultural training is not now considered essential to an "educa-

tion." We are equipping specialists rather than developing minds. This may be one of the reasons why the proper cultivation of the spiritual nature is so largely ignored in institutions of learning. President Paul D. Moody, of Middlebury College, is among leaders who are awake in this matter, and he has reminded us, in an address at a corporation dinner of that school, of the danger of education that lacks spiritual balance. The *Congregationalist* reports him thus:

"I would rather see the wind sweeping through the empty ruins of what was once Middlebury College than see its education in any sense Godless. To increase a man's knowledge without touching his heart is to play with fire. It only increases his danger to society. The whole world is suffering and will suffer for a generation principally because our material advance has outrun our spiritual progress. We have taught man, who in ancient times killed his neighbor with a stone in his fist, to use a gun with a range of sixty miles, but his heart is still subject to the same passions that influenced his primitive ancestors. Middlebury rejoices in the fact that its faculty is avowedly Christian. We claim that we are not true to our trust if we are sending young people out into the world fitted with knowledge but without a moral and spiritual development. We aim at all-roundness of character, and we are looking for the day when a student will not be graduated, no matter how much he knows, who we do not feel will be a helpful, positive factor in society. The increased number who are seeking admission places a higher responsibility upon the college to select only those who can best serve the communities into which they are to go."

A MAN WITH MEDIOCRE ABILITIES, BUT WITH INDEPENDENCE and self-reliance, is more apt to achieve something than is a man of exceptional mental powers, but handicapped by a constant anxiety over the opinions of others. The highly developed conventions of modern life have an unfortunate tendency to incline one to dread the consequences of disapproval. In this connection certain words of President Coolidge, in a speech when he was first elected president of the Massachusetts State Senate, come as a tonic, not only to legislators, but to

every one whose work is open to observation and who is in danger of being swerved by criticism:

“Do your day’s work. If it be to protect the rights of the weak, whoever objects, do it. If it be to help a powerful corporation to better serve the public, whatever the opposition, do that. Expect to be called a standpatter, but don’t be a standpatter. Be prepared to be called a demagogue, but don’t be a demagogue. Don’t hesitate to be as revolutionary as science, or as reactionary as the multiplication table. Don’t expect to build up the weak by pulling down the strong.”

RIGHTLY OR WRONG, ONE OF THE SUPREME AIMS IN LIFE IS the elimination of work. Labor-saving machinery is only one phase of the working out of this desire. Young men avoid hard positions and dream of the time when they will have enough to “retire,” and most of us scheme to avoid doing more things than are absolutely necessary. No business or profession is free from temptations to shirk. The late Sir William Robertson Nicoll, editor of *The British Weekly*, in writing upon his career in journalism, said with reference to the need of hard work in journalism and the ministry:

“One thing at least is certain. In order to make anything of life, both the preacher and the journalist must work unsparingly. Without work, and work carried to the point of sacrifice, they will accomplish nothing. In journalism, the man who works with one hand is soon thrown out, and it is this much more than anything else that sifts the crowd of applicants. They are afraid of work. In the ministry the same law holds. Two dear friends of mine—Dr. John Watson and Dr. Marcus Dods—were completely possessed by this conviction. I remember Dr. Watson talking of some young men whom he liked. ‘But,’ he summed up reflectively, ‘not one of them knew what work means.’ Dr. Dods was so possessed with this thought that he seemed to attribute every failure in the ministry to laziness. He seemed to think that any one might be successful who really worked. It is certain that many who fail do not work. These have a longer tenure than the journalist. They may stay on till their churches are almost empty. But the time is coming when that will be impossible, and when for

the lazy journalist and the lazy minister there will be the same short shrift."

A COLLEGE PRESIDENT ONCE REMARKED THAT HE HAD A GOOD bit of sympathy for an editor because, among all professional men, he had the least opportunity to see the results of his work. Usually but a small proportion of a periodical's readers take the trouble to write to the editor their opinions of it, favorable or otherwise. In fact, many readers have a rather hazy idea of his functions. We were once told by a successful business man of many and varied interests, that all a religious editor had to do was to make a few clippings and write a few editorials.

Except in the case of hurried publications, chiefly newspapers, the editor often has to finish the work of the contributor. It is amazing how negligent are even scholarly writers in the ordinary matters of composition—spelling, punctuation, even grammar, and in the arrangement of words and phrases. Not only so, but some persons unconsciously weave into an article upon a broad subject their individual, and objectionable, eccentricities and prejudices. In all these things, and more besides, the editor has to remember his obligations to the reader as well as to the writer and to adjust matters to the best interests of both. Mr. John Jay Chapman, in an article in *The New York Times*, makes this illuminating comment on the editor's relation to his writers and readers:

"There is always a mystical union between the mind of the writer and his reader. The reader's mind is almost a part of the writer's mind; and unless the reader finds himself at home in the tale or the argument, and dragged along by it, he'll not waste his time over it. And now comes the editor or publisher and mixes himself in the mysterious current of mind which is passing between the two. Let us watch what the editor does. He is guiding the writer toward the public, and naturally enough toward the larger public. He takes pride in his authors, no doubt, but it is apt to be pride in their circulation and to be expressed in a sort of pious joy over the fact that God has enabled him to do good by reaching so many souls. I have

never known an editor of the better class who was not something of an evangelist.

"A mere publisher of books may perhaps take a cynical view of his own functions, but a good editor always sees himself as the true friend to both writer and reader."

IT IS SOMETIMES PROFITABLE TO DEFINE A TERM THAT IS IN every-day use, and to learn something of its origin. We speak of evangelical truth, or the evangelical churches, but what does this word evangelical mean? The term Protestant is another that might be studied. These words are often used interchangeably, but each has its peculiar signification. In speaking of a Catholic prediction as to the survival of the name Protestant, The Lutheran gives this brief word study, which may well be kept in mind:

"*Protestant* is not an exact name for our church. The right adjective to use is Evangelical. Protestant is in strictness opposed to Papist and Evangelical distinguishes from Catholic. The use of the word Protestant dates back to the year 1529, when a group of princes refused to obey the edict of the Diet of Spire. This Diet (Diet meaning a regularly called assembly of the princes of the State) had revoked the action of a previous Diet, and required the banning of Luther and the restoration of Catholicism in the territory of the princes. The evangelical princes *protested*; they did more: they disobeyed the edict. The name Protestant became a title of the party of these 'unwilling' princes and was generally applied when the Calvinistic Reformation opposed the Pope, but differed in doctrine from the Lutherans. It is a name that in itself is not descriptive of more than one principle. It does stand for opposition to papistry, to hierarchical authority. It is unlikely to die while Rome continues her political maneuvers. But it could disappear as a party label if the Roman Church confined her pleas to matters religious. Until that change occurs, Protestantism is a title of good meaning and likely to remain.

"Before the word Protestant was employed, those who afterwards were thus named called themselves 'Evangelical.' That is, they insisted that salvation is not attained by the rites and interposition of the Church, but by the Grace of God through Christ. The Means of Grace, that is the manner,

method, and the instrument divinely ordained, connects with the Gospel—the Evangel. ‘The Gospel is the Power of God unto Salvation,’ not the Church, and especially not a person, who claims to be the successor of Peter. The word Catholic—meaning that which had always and everywhere been believed—was shown to be a camouflage. Very little which distinguishes the Roman Church is of apostolic origin. The name Catholic was not known in the first century. What it meant in the early period of Christianity was so far from what it means now, as to require a hypothetical source, which is called Tradition. Nor has the original significance of tradition been broad enough to form the basis of Roman Catholicism. It meant in an early day, certain facts and practises that were ‘remembered’ but not written in the accepted Scriptures. No doubt sayings and doings of the Apostles were related by one generation to the next. Because these verbal teachings became corrupt, a canon of Scripture became accepted as the source and standard of teaching and authority. But the political ingenuity of powerful prelates revived the word and gave its significance to doctrines invented to fit strange rites, curious ceremonies and sacred places, but especially to bolster ambitious schemes for acquiring authority for Rome. Eventually all the ‘traditions’ were used up, but meantime the decisions of church councils were given the value of Holy Writ. As a climax, and incidentally to insure a reliable continuance of moral and religious guidance, the Pope as the successor of Peter was proclaimed infallible when speaking *ex cathedra*, that is, from his holy office, concerning religion and morals.

“Against this ‘Catholicism’ the Evangelical system is in sharp opposition. The world owes the recovery of certainty to the uncovering of the Bible, wherein and whereby that Word which the Lord Christ ordained to be the instrument of grace is preserved.”

FOR IMPRESSIVE SPECTACLES THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH has never had a rival. By spectacles here is meant those major formalities that attract, not so much the eyes, as the minds of men. The power of suggestion is very great, especially with the masses, so that a magnificent event is somehow associated with great importance and great significance. It is natural, therefore, that the announcement of another “Holy Year,”

to be inaugurated at Rome, Christmas Eve of 1924, has already been counted worthy of considerable news space. Frederick Cunliffe Owen has given in the press a rather full account of the institution known as the Holy Year, from which these extracts are taken:

"It will be the twenty-second of these jubilees of the Roman Catholic Church that were first instituted by Pope Boniface VIII in 1300 with such success that, as Dante tells us in his 'Inferno,' a strong barrier had to be constructed along the bridge of the Holy Angels in order to keep the crowds flocking to St. Peter's from mingling with and obstructing those who were coming in a contrary direction. It is a matter of record that over 2,000,000 foreigners visited Rome in connection with the celebration, and in the words of the historian Gibbon, 'From the remote kingdom of Britain the highways were thronged with swarms of Pilgrims, who sought to expiate their sins in the journey to Rome.'

"The 'Holy Years' were continued at intervals of fifty or twenty-five years until 1775, and owing to the Napoleonic wars and to the presence of a French army of invasion in Rome at the end of the eighteenth century, the twentieth celebration was not held until 1825, during the Pontificate of Leo XII. For in 1850 Pius IX had been obliged by revolutionists to flee from the Eternal City to the Neapolitan stronghold of Gaeta, while in 1875 he felt too keenly the recent loss of the temporal power of the Papacy to be inclined to do anything in the shape of public festivities. In 1900, however, Leo XIII returned to the custom last observed by Leo XII in 1825 and inaugurated the present century with the celebration of the twenty-first of these jubilees; and now Pius XI has announced that the next and twenty-second 'Holy Year' is to receive its celebration throughout 1925, the observance beginning on the eve of Christmas, 1924, with a solemn ceremony in St. Peter's at Rome.

"The Holy Father is anxious that in view of the popular encouragement and support given to the well-nigh ubiquitous mission work of the Church, its members and the subscribers to this vast international undertaking should have some opportunity of visualizing the scope of the work and the far-reaching nature of its endeavors. Every diocese, every religious order that has at heart some special missionary enterprise of its own to which it devotes its particular efforts, will be ac-

corded the opportunity of bringing to the attention of its co-religionists and of the public in general the nature of its good work in this connection, and especially of its fruition and success.

"But Pius XI does not propose to limit the celebration of the next 'Anno Santo' to this international exhibition at the Vatican. The Holy Father has a far more important project in view for 1925. It is nothing more nor less than the resumption of the deliberations of the last Oecumenical Council in the Basilica of St. Peter. It may be recalled that the last Oecumenical Council, the twentieth in the history of the Church since the Council of Nicaea, in A. D. 325—the first one to be held since the Council of Trent in 1563 was brought to a premature close, after eight months' deliberations, by the sudden outbreak of war between France and Germany in 1870.

"And if Pius XI follows the example of Pius IX he will issue special bulls conveying invitations to the Bishops and Archbishops of the Oriental and Orthodox Greek rites, to the Lutheran Bishops of Scandinavia, to the Protestant Bishops of Great Britain and of the United States, indeed, to the responsible heads of all other Christian denominations on the broad ground that all people who have received Christian baptism are included in the brotherhood of Christianity, and are entitled to give their views, if not actually to vote in an Oecumenical Council which is held in the interests and for the welfare of Christianity.

"In 1870 none of these non-Catholics took part in the actual deliberations of the Vatican Council."

EVERYONE KNOWS THAT CHRISTIAN TRUTH IS MOST READILY and most profitably appropriated during the early years, and the psychologist is ready to support this principle with facts and figures. Yet the Sunday School—or, in the better modern term, the Church School—is too largely neglected by the older members of the church, who might do much simply by their presence. But the great work of the Sunday School still goes forward, and still brings cheering results. Here is a synopsis of the accomplishments of The American Sunday School Union for over a century, but the figures showing its present efficiency are of most importance:

"The Union in its 106 years has organized 138,000 schools, into which it has gathered five and a half million people, chiefly children. During the past seventeen years there have been organized out of the schools it planted 1139 churches of different denominations.

"This society has pioneered the way, going into communities where no Christian work was being done for the children. As soon as the way opened for church organization it has left the denominational choice to the people themselves.

"The past year has been one of the most vigorous in its history. It has either organized or reorganized 1800 schools, Adding these to those already in operation, it has supervised the work of 6000 schools, most of them meeting in public school houses, but some 600 in abandoned churches, 250 in public halls, 150 in farm homes, and others in all sorts of places like railroad stations, box cars, under brush arbors, etc. Its missionaries have paid great attention to home visitation, having made more than 200,000 visits to families, and in the course of this work distributed over 19,000 Gospels, Testaments and Bibles. For its schools and others desiring a sound, union, evangelical literature, it has issued a dozen periodicals, with a circulation of some 2,000,000, and published 200,000 books, booklets, and other school requisites. More than 5000 persons, young and old, have professed conversion in connection with its work during the year, and forty-seven churches have grown out of its schools."

PERSONS WHO ARE LOOKING FOR A FIELD OF SOCIAL SERVICE where there is great need, plenty of obstacles to overcome, and no promise of overwhelming compensation may find it in our penal and eleemosynary institutions. Revelations of the treatment of prisoners in different parts of the country continue to furnish revolting reading. And there is reason to believe that, if the inside story of the management of many almshouses and "homes" for various types of the helpless were to be told, it would be a disgrace to our civilization.

The trouble in many cases, if not in most, lies in the personnel of the immediate management. Too often the official in charge is no more than an indifferently qualified political job-holder. The presence of a capable personality with a con-

science at the head of a prison or charitable institution is apt to make the difference between brutality and misery on the one hand, and humanity and decent existence on the other. Commenting on some recent cases, The Pittsburgh Christian Advocate not long ago remarked:

"Following the stories of the inhuman treatment of prisoners in labor camps in Florida, where they were starved and beaten and even murdered by brutal overseers, came the story of the inside prison treatment of inmates of the New Jersey State Prison at Trenton, where men have been so brutally treated that it is said a large number of them have been taken each year to insane asylums. Now comes the almost unbelievable revelation of conditions in the Eastern Penitentiary of this state, where, according to the report of the Grand Jury investigating the prison, traffic on a large scale in narcotics by visitors, guards and inmates has been permitted, stills for the manufacture of liquors have been found in the cells of prisoners, firearms, knives, hatchets and other weapons have been in the possession of inmates, gross immoralities have been practiced, betting and crap games have been openly permitted, and the most dangerous of the criminals have been allowed to dominate the whole of the 1,400 prisoners.

"The Grand Jury, among other findings, very significantly says: 'The personnel of the administrative staff needs thorough reorganization.'

"In her report of the findings of the Hart-Whiteman investigation of all the prisons of this state, in which the evils of overcrowding, idleness and unrest are emphasized, Dr. Ellen C. Potter, head of the Department of Public Welfare, says: 'Our problem will not be solved under any law until we have men as wardens who have a vision of their task as one of social reconstruction.' * * *

"There is urgent need that others besides wardens have the vision of what prisons are for and what can be done in them. It is high time that the people recognize the fact that it is a crime, an inexcusable crime, against the public as well as against the prisoners to put them in the hands of incompetent, careless or brutal men as a reward for the partisan political activity of such fellows.

"Only men of character who have the spirit of service are fit to have the care of prisoners in any capacity from directors

and wardens down to guards and laborers. Neither prisoners nor society can afford to have these men exploited in the interest of party politics or politicians.

"Neglect and injustice done to prisoners means another harvest of crime, instead of that reform at which all prison discipline and treatment should aim."

The jails of the country particularly need an overhauling, both physical and moral. The Churchman lately published an interview with Dean Charles N. Lathrop, of the Department of Christian Social Service, who has made a study of the jail situation. Here are some of the things the interviewer reports him as saying:

"There are three federal prisons in the country,' said Dean Lathrop. 'The states have their state prisons as well as one or more penitentiaries. Besides these, every county has its jail and cities have their prisons and police jails. It is these minor jails that have been least considered and are most the subject of the present campaign. It is in these jails particularly that crime is fostered, health broken and the man sentenced to them made subject to influences and conditions that permanently impair him morally, mentally and physically, and turn him out often a menace and just as often a burden on society.'"

"Briefly, the principal evils of such jails,' said Dean Lathrop, 'may be summed up as follows:

"Most of them are unspeakably filthy. Jails which make any pretense at cleanliness are in the extreme minority. Air and light are usually lacking to an astounding degree. Men are confined in cells at night four feet wide—their cots two feet wide—and hardly high enough to stand in. Sanitary arrangements are generally of the most primitive and offensive kind. Bedding is frequently filthy. I have been warned by keepers not to brush against a wall with my coat sleeve because of the vermin.

"Contamination from predecessors in a cell is almost inevitable, especially because of the lowered vitality of systems of men who live in foul air and without sunlight.

"Idleness is general. There is rarely work for more than half the inmates of the average jail, and what there is is rarely of an absorbing or beneficial sort. Without the distraction of

work, jail inmates are usually without any access to relaxation or distraction of any healthy or normal kind.

"The system generally in vogue in the county and town jails, Dean Lathrop explained, was to turn the prisoners into a common pen or corridor on which their cells open, during the day.

"Understand," he said, "there is no segregation. Young lads—first offenders, waiting sentence for some minor misdemeanor—are thrown in company with hardened criminal types, with men guilty of every sort of depravity, old offenders whose lives are moulded by the musty, sinister environment of similar jails. In women's wards old and young women—prostitutes and young girls who have, possibly, stolen a little article from some shop or even only been accused of the act—all sorts may be thrown together.

"There is no segregation of clean from unclean, of healthy from diseased. And disease of the most repulsive sort is common enough. I have seen jails where even insane prisoners were kept in the same quarters as mentally normal types.

"In such surroundings the strongest character—let alone the impulsive, weak sort that somehow filters into our jails for unimportant offenses—would be demoralized."

THE PROPOSAL TO ENACT A LAW IS PROPERLY AN ISSUE, BUT AT present the question of the thorough enforcement of the prohibition law is actually in the way of becoming an issue in itself. The people of this country are faced by a test of their willingness to obey its laws and of their ability to enforce them. In the preface to a series of articles in *The New York Times*, upon prohibition enforcement, Roy A. Haynes, United States Prohibition Commissioner, made this statement, to which the most earnest attention of every citizen should be called:

"The real crux of the whole matter, however, is found in the fact that the problem has greatly outgrown the prohibition question, for as in the 60's a greater problem than slavery grew out of that issue—the preservation of the Union itself—just so a greater problem than the prohibition question has grown out of it, and that is the preservation of the sanctity and majesty of all law, the saving of the Constitution, the foundation of the Government itself. So all careful observers

agree that America to-day is facing the testing time; the time when this great self-governing people is to determine whether or not a democracy is strong enough to make and enforce its own laws. That issue is paramount and dissociated from prohibition. It is no longer a question as to whether we are for or against that legislation, but it is whether or not we are for or against the Constitution of the United States, and whether or not we will obey and support the laws of the land."

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS ARE APT TO BE MISLEADING, THOUGH probably most of us base our opinions, and even actions, upon them more often than upon carefully ascertained facts. Opinions differ widely as to the causes of some of the common social phenomena about us, but now and then some one takes pains to gather statistics upon which safer judgment may be based. Take, for example, the divorce problem. What are the leading causes of divorce in American life?

The statistical records of the Domestic Relations Division of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia are commonly referred to by social workers as the "Book of Life," and The Philadelphia Bulletin not long since published from it these instructive findings:

"A great majority of these cases of desertion and non-support occur in the early years of married life. There is interesting human material to be culled from the reports of our investigators. A great many of the squabbles in early married life arise from the fact that the romance of the first attraction has vanished, and the steadying force of conjugal affection, that ought to smooth the path, has not had its full effect.

"This is the danger point of early married life. The longing for the delight of care-free youth comes over the man, or his fancy is captured by some other girl who is not tied down at home by children.

"He sees his own little wife fretting about the children. She probably has lost some of her girlish charms.

"Of a total of 5,789 cases of desertion and non-support, 505 complaints came from couples who had been married less than a year: 489 cases after one year of married life. There were only 355 cases of couples married for four years and 337

cases of desertion after five years of married life, and a gradual decline thereafter.

"The statistics disprove the assertion that early marriages are productive of more desertions. The ages between 20 and 24 constitute 36 per cent. of desertions studied, while marriages of couples less than 20 years constitute only 31 per cent.

"It was brought out that the length of acquaintanceship before marriage furnishes more of a key to the problem of desertion than the age at the time of marriage. It was found in studying 1,200 cases that a third of the desertion cases reported were of couples who had married after an acquaintanceship of a year or less."

IT IS EASY TO CRITICISE A PEOPLE AS TO CRITICISE PEOPLE. Take the Chinese. For years we have been getting fragmentary accounts of their difficulties, until it is not hard to form the impression that they are a turbulent lot, much given to fratricidal strife. But it must be remembered that they are in the midst of a struggle to establish a modern state out of the most ancient and custom-bound civilization in the world. This cannot be done in a moment. In a recent interview Mr. C. W. Harvey, who has spent twenty years as a Y. M. C. A. secretary in China, recounted the experiences of that country during its later history. After speaking of the recent capture of travelers by bandits, he continued:

"This incident becomes intelligible when we recall the situation in China and throughout the entire world in recent years. China was monarchical in government until 1912. The monarchy was forcibly overthrown at that time and the beginnings of a republic were inaugurated. Two years later, or 1914, the great war broke on the world. China's struggle for democracy and stable government has been going on, therefore, simultaneously with the greatest war and political breakdown in history. To establish a democracy from an autocracy in a nation of 400,000,000 people with ancient and deep-seated traditions, with a non-Christian civilization, with 90 per cent. or more of illiteracy, and at a time when the world is at war and in chaos, is a very difficult task. In this connection we should not forget the experiences of France, the republics of Central and South America, Russia and the United States."

BOOKS

HELLENISM AND CHRISTIANITY ¹

The reading and re-reading of this modest but notable volume of essays has awakened in the reviewer an intense longing for the development among ourselves of the type of scholarship exhibited here. For some reason more or less mysterious, the peculiar quality which I find here, so far as my own experience goes, has been confined largely to men trained in the British universities.

In this book learning shows a certain warmth and mellowness which are most engaging. There is apparent a completeness of assimilation, a harmonization of the mind with its content of thought and information, a clarity of vision, which are evidently the fruit of long meditation upon large numbers of vital facts. There is another quality about this book which I find a little more difficult to put into words. It is unhurried throughout and unlabored to an amazing degree, considering the range and compass of its inductive material—but that isn't exactly what I mean. It is the ability to construct a powerful argument without seeming to do so—to build out of gossamer threads a logical net that will hold. Attention has been called in these pages to Arthur Balfour's gift in this line. He is able with seeming lightness and even carelessness of touch to enmesh one in an argument upon which he himself seems to lay little stress, but which grips. Bevan has this same instinct for cogency, this allusive and seemingly indifferent way of proposing a conclusive argument, as if it were merely a tentative suggestion.

The volume before us consists of thirteen essays on various subjects which appear, at first blush, to be rather miscellaneous. The author claims for them only "a mental unity—a single body of interests, observations, and ideas, which is

¹ *Hellenism and Christianity*, by Edwyn Bevan, Honorary Fellow of New College, Oxford. New York, 1922. Pp. 275.

one individual's reaction to the spectacle of the universe" (Preface, p. 5). As usual, Mr. Bevan claims less than he is really entitled to according to the score. He has given us a series of typical studies in the relationship of the Christian scheme of thought and life to the world process into which it entered. The whole work is controlled by what may be called the *new* view of history, which involves a far subtler and more difficult task than any which historical science has set itself in preceding ages. This new aim of history Mr. Bevan has described very succinctly and also very beautifully in the following paragraph:

"What we now want to do with the documents of the past is something far more ambitious than what our fathers attempted, and yet we must realize, in a way that they could not have done, how hard that ambition is to satisfy. The 'facts' of history in the narrower sense of the word—the issue of a battle, the promulgation of a law, the establishment of a religion—have a rational interest, we perceive, only in connection with a larger context of human life, a life which was actually the experience of individuals, and involved a whole world of ideas, of emotions, of desires. * * * And it is just this context of past events, this atmosphere of ideas, emotions, and desires, that it is so hard to recapture" (p. 59f.).

The essay from which these words are taken is a particularly fine example of the method of historical interpretation which is herein described—and incidentally the most thrilling essay in the book. I have used that "movie" word "thrilling" with deliberate intent. This essay, which deals with the First Contact of Christianity and Paganism, is genuinely thrilling. I emphasize that fact for several reasons. One is that religious books are commonly reputed to be dull. A writer in a prominent New York Book review, in the course of a joint review of half a dozen religious books just off the press, made the general remark that most of them were uncompromisingly boresome. He asserted that even writers who had decided literary gifts became hopelessly uninteresting when writing on religious topics. On the contrary, there is not a dull page in this whole book. Dullness is usually due, as I

see it, to one of two things, either dwelling too long on a single topic, with a consequent insufficient variety, or more commonly to a lack of enthusiasm. Bevan is guilty of neither of these offenses. The whole discussion is thus intensely interesting. The essay which we are now considering describes the coming of Christ into the life of the Graeco-Roman world under the Caesars with a tremendously dramatic intensity. He begins thus:

"At any time between eighteen or nineteen hundred years ago some millions of souls were going through the experience of life in the countries ruled by Caesar round about the Mediterranean Sea. * * * There was but little * * * to distinguish the men of nineteen hundred years ago from the populations of Southern Europe to-day. These things made up a great part of the world into which men of that day found themselves born, a world large and shining and manifold. But for us this particular world round about the Mediterranean nineteen centuries ago has an interest of an altogether peculiar kind. Something happened in it so momentous, it is believed, that it marks a new beginning in human history. Our popular reckoning, looking back upon the past, divides it into the years before and the years after an event which took place at that moment of time. Into the stream of passing generations there entered just then, there was seen for about thirty years, Someone who has been ever since the great problem. He was not among those who, while they were here, wrote down words which men may still read. He wrote nothing. All we know of what He was, of what He said, is from the memories of His friends. But what was written in those memories was of such a sort that the world has never since been able to escape from the personal force which grasped it through that reflection" (pp. 61-63).

I have given this particular section somewhat at length so that the reader may get an adequate conception of the way in which Mr. Bevan introduces his incomparable discussion of the first contact of Christianity with Paganism. With entirely adequate command of the necessary facts, from the point of view of scholarship, Mr. Bevan everywhere transcends mere scholarship through his effective use of the historical imagina-

tion and his way of illuminating facts so that they awaken interest instead of repelling and dulling it.

Perhaps the most important essay in general application is the first one, in which the author rides atilt at the

"East is East
West is West
And never the twain shall meet"

idea, of which, if I may be allowed modestly to judge, the essayist leaves very little that is really worthy of consideration. He shows, first of all, that the generalizations "East" and "West" have very little exact observation to rest upon, that what is taken as typically Oriental is found in the West and *vice versa*; that judgments as to the characteristics of either section are frequently local peculiarities illegitimately generalized; that constant interchange between East and West has been taking place throughout history; and, finally, that the characteristics which are considered typical of races are really those which belong to different stages of intellectual development. Mr. Bevan points out that our modern civilization is the direct descendant of that initiated by the Greeks, and when carefully defined in harmony with its fundamental characteristics is seen to be not specifically European nor Western nor modern, but rationalistic. The real meaning of the Hellenism which we inherit is just this:

"The singular development of these mental faculties, which we associate with rationalism, the critical intellect, the bent to submit traditions and belief to logical examination, the desire to get the values of things in their real proportions. It was because the Greeks could stand off from established custom, and ask the reason Why, that they could make political progress; because they could feel the inadequacy of ancestral mythology and ask what the world was really made of, that they could lay the foundations of rational science. * * * The answers which the old Greeks worked out to their questions may not satisfy us to-day; the important thing is that they began putting these questions in this way at all. If our thoughts have been carried further, it was they who began the train of thought. All the development of knowledge, of com-

mand over the forces of Nature, of purposeful order, which is meant by the term 'Western Civilization' to-day, has had for its moving principle a rationalism whose origin is to be found in the Greek city-states" (p. 15).

This is what is really meant by Western civilization. Mr. Bevan points out at the same time that it is quite impossible and misleading to attempt any generalization for the "East," which is complex, heterogeneous, and, hence, irreducible to simple formulas or snapshot judgments.

One of the most interesting of Mr. Bevan's essays is the second—that on Bacchylides of Ceos, whose additional thousand lines discovered a couple of decades ago created such a ferment among classical scholars. Mr. Bevan's use of Bacchylides is to point out a strange and anomalous feature of the history of Greek literature—the brevity of its period of creative energy and the suddenness of its arrest. "It is a strange feature of Greek literary history that the tradition, instead of remaining fluid and progressive, crystallizes at a certain point fast and immovable" (p. 41). He asks the suggestive question why this sudden arrest in the ancient world, "when in our own world fresh springs of creative invention continue to break out" (p. 42). He gives no categorical answer—"perhaps an incalculable element will always be there, of which *Dei gratia* is the only account that can ever be given" (p. 42).

But in this connection the significance from the view point of literature of the product of the new Christian movement is worth noting. Bevan says:

"It is significant that in the sketch of Greek literature which a great Hellenist, Wilamowitz-Mollendorff, contributed not long ago to 'Die Kultur der Gegenwart,' Paul of Tarsus is given a prominent place. 'That this Greek of his has no connection with any school or any model, that it streams as best it may from the heart in an impetuous torrent, and yet is real Greek, not translated Aramaic (like the sayings of Jesus), makes him a classic of Hellenism. Now at last, at last, one can hear in Greek the utterance of an inner experience, fresh and living'" (p. 71f.).

Bevan says also: "Simply as eloquence or literature, 1 Corinthians XIII is superior to anything in Dio Chrysostom."

One of the most suggestive of all these essays and perhaps altogether the most original is the eighth on Dirt. I am tempted, almost beyond my strength to resist, to quote this wonderful, subtle, and uplifting essay, but refrain, partly because my space is nearly used up and partly because it would not be quite "sporting" to deprive any reader of the privilege of discovering this choice bit for himself. I pass to the last essay, which for spiritual vision crowns the work. There are undoubtedly some things in the book with which some of its readers will not agree, but all that Mr. Bevan says is marked by reverence and the sort of insight which makes one glad to know what he thinks even if one does not quite agree with it. Let me close with a sentence or two of his on the apologetic of the future—or of the present, which is the same thing:

"Argument, generally speaking, in religion, can do no more than clear the track; it cannot make the engine move. One may, I think, divine that if the Christian Church is going to further its cause in the days to come, it will be by exhibiting a certain type of life realized in practice. * * * Supposing, that the love which shines in certain individual Christian lives became general in the Christian society—a quickening of emotion and will which could be called love, not in any pale, metaphorical sense, but in literal truth, a force shaping all conduct and social organization, heightening all life with an inexhaustible interest and energy—there would perhaps not be much need for books of Christian evidences" (p. 273f.).

The single page of reflections which follow this statement are worth more than many volumes.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

LICHT VOM OSTEN²

This work has a rare distinction. Two editions appeared in England—English translations, before the World War. This

² *Licht vom Osten*. The New Testament and the Newly Discovered Texts of the Greco-Roman World. By Adolf Deissmann. Fourth completely revised edition, with 83 facsimiles in the text. Tübingen, Germany, 1923. Pp. XVIII + 447.

simple fact should make this work (over 400 pages 8vo) immune against silly, supercilious or superficial reviews or depreciations. For many so-called reviews are precisely that. Herr Professor Deissmann (of the University of Berlin), somewhat like Sir William Ramsay, has traced, in a way, the footsteps of the greatest of the apostles, chiefly in Asia Minor, or, as we now, with a glance towards Angora, are accustomed to say, in Anatolia.

Far be it from me to be foolishly censorious of any effort to gain a closer vision of primitive or original Christianity. Now the Fayum papyri exhibit and keep uncovering a type of Greek which is essentially of the same fiber or texture as our New Testament. Term after term, especially as practiced among plain folk, does the author adduce to fortify or illumine corresponding verbiage in New Testament lexicography or idiom. His bibliographical footnotes alone (inclusive of work done by Americans, such as Howard Crosby Butler, W. K. Prentice, and Duane Read Stuart) make the work a requisite for theological teachers and seminaries of Christian divinity.

There are many sweeping and enthusiastic passages which we would gladly cite in full, were there space. I translate now from page 114: "The N. T. as a whole is a people's book [*Volksbuch*]. Hence we hold thus: When Luther took the N. T. from the doctors and made a present of it to the people, he returned to the people its own. And when to-day in some attic room we behold an old dame amid the fuchsias and geraniums of her window-sill bent over the open N. T., then the old book has found a place, to which it belongs by its essence. Or when a hospital attendant found a Japanese N. T. in the knapsack of a wounded Japanese soldier, then this particular spot too was a welcome one for the old book." Or again, from page 127: "Preached to the lowly, the revelation of grace, with ever renewed divine energy, later on takes hold of the great ones, an Augustine, a Luther." From page 128: "The great reformation of Paul, his struggle for grace, his struggle

against the righteousness of works, practically confronted not only current Judaism, but also the cults of the nations."

But now I must beg to advert to some points of divergence or dissent from Dr. Deissmann, especially as to the vain effort to find *any* bridge between classic civilization and primitive Christianity. The present reviewer does not say this lightly. He has spent some half-century of his life in tracing, sifting, weighing what we may call the spiritual elements of classic civilization (*Testimonium Animae*, 1908). Here Dr. Deissmann does not seem to be at home. The mere fact that he names Mommsen (the Hegelian) and Friedlander's *Roemische Sittengeschichte* as adequate repertories of classic civilization suggests his limitations, and the traditional idealization of classic antiquity as the *Aurea Aetas* of mankind, an idealization long practiced in the German *gymnasium*, has left traces in the pages of this book. Has Dr. Deissmann ever studied (and verified) Doellinger's *Judenthum und Heidenthum*, the great work of 1857, never excelled since? Classic paganism certainly (in spite of all the fanciful parallels in Clement of Alexandria) will never lead up to Christ or Paul or John.

Nothing is more readily uttered and nothing is an emptier generalization than "the religion of the Greeks" and the like. As a matter of fact there were hundreds of local cults, determined or circumscribed by ethnical, political, military data of the past, cults co-extensive with some valley or some stretch of common countryside, beginning with the gods and men of Homer and Hesiod and going on to the very sack of Rome by Alaric, 410 A. D., a time when the Old Believers of Rome, with their Neoplatonism and their *Theokrasia* were mightily striving to sustain or buttress the crazy edifice of paganism, whose sole element of unity then consisted in a common aversion for the Gospel of Christ crucified and risen again, as one may see in Julian and his model, Libanius. To understand the secular "religion" of the Hellenic work, say under the Antonines, I would beg to suggest to Dr. Deissmann another but very concrete form of light from the East, viz., a critical and compara-

tive study of Pausanias (the pious and conservative Periegete from Lydia), and the Voltaire of that generation, Lucian of Samosata, the man of Syrian birth, Greek culture, Roman name.

May I here be permitted to adduce a witness who will tell us how a given "religion" (or body of ritual) was conceived in the eventide of the Roman Republic. Thus spoke Cicero in 59 B. C. (four years after the birth of Augustus): "Each state has its own religion; *we* [Romans] have our own. With Jerusalem standing and with the Jews subdued, nevertheless the religion of that ritual [the Jewish] shrank from the brilliancy of this [our] Empire, from the weight of our name, from the institutions of our ancestors. At the present moment the more so, because that nationality [the Jews] showed by warfare what it thought of our sway, it taught how dear it was to the immortal gods because it was defeated, because it was let out to tribute, because enslaved". (*Pro Flacco*, 69.)

Ephesus figures much in Deissmann's book. He has a new theory about Romans 16, a novel theory, viz., that that final chapter originally was a little note to—the Ephesians, but somehow, as it lacked proper inscription, by some mechanism or some luck or other (having been a floating island, like Delos), finally grafted itself upon the extant end of Romans. Beginning with such a frail and delicate conjecture, the author further on and quite cheerfully operates with it quite as though it were something proven. We sometimes meet this sort of *Wissenschaft* with all the earmarks of "high" or "higher" criticism in other lands as well. Young people are over-awed by this in lecture rooms and seminaries.

Nor can I assent to Deissmann's naive thesis of depriving the Pauline Epistles of any doctrinal substance or purport, let alone dogmatic authority. They are, if I read him aright, just psychological emanations (to him) of given situations or moods. *Non possumus*. The itch for denying revelation is in evidence everywhere. Some of his parallelisms between New Testament and ordinary life in Egypt are fairly plausible;

more are far-fetched. Now the soul of mortal and sinful man seeks a positive something, seeks not only a $\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\omega$, but also a $\pi\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\omega\theta\omega$.

As for Paul, Deissmann enormously stresses the artisan and craftsman in Paul, and that it was his crudity of personal culture which drove him so continually to dictate. A favorite notion. More likely I think, that Paul resorted to it because of the multitude of his daily tasks and activities. A Roman citizen by birth, Paul at Tarsus picked up Greek as easily as an American child of Scandinavian or German descent would gain English in Fort Wayne, St. Louis or St. Paul. Why shrink from the assumption that he had some course with a *grammatikos* in his native town, before he essayed a graduate course in Hebraism and Pharisaism at Jerusalem? I believe he heard the Septuagint every Sabbath at Tarsus. A word as to that capital of Cilicia. Strabo describes it with affectionate reminiscence, and assigns it a rank close to or quite equal to that of Athens and Alexandria, especially in philosophy, adding that the academic exponents of it at Tarsus were in the main natives, whereas they were *advenae* in Athens and Alexandria.

Two of our Lord's disciples had Greek names, Philip and Andrew. Think of the Decapolis and especially of Gadara, native places of eminent Hellenists, such as Philodemos the Epicurean (contemporary of Cicero), Menippos the satirist, Theodoros the rhetorician, teacher and intimate afterward of the Emperor Tiberius, whose procurator in Judaea was Pontius Pilate.

Another conjectural thesis of Deissmann is that the primitive Christians honored Jesus by the predicate, Lord, in conscious antagonism to the Emperor-worship of the Empire. This, too, impresses me as far-fetched, though not farther fetched than many other parallelisms in this charming book. And I am well aware that refusal to swear *per genium Principis*, say on the anniversary of an Emperor's birthday, might cost any subject his life, and that his aloofness probably was

one of the strongest motives for the persecutions from Nero to Diocletian, 303 A. D., vastly more so than the Christian's attitude toward the *agalmata* of local or municipal cults.

I will close this inadequate review of an important work with a contribution of my own, an exegetical aid to Acts 19:27, the worship of the Ephesian Artemis. Strabo (641) relates the rights of asylum held by this sanctuary (one of the Seven Wonders of the World), rights maintained in his own day. Alexander the Great set one stadium (one-eighth of a mile) as the extent of the sacred zone of immunity; Mithradates Eupator increased this a little; Mark Antony (42-31 B. C.) doubled this, including a part of the city, thus giving veritable privileges to the criminal class. Augustus (after 31) cancelled this extension.

For the philological student of the New Testament Dr. Deissmann's book, in matters like phonetic spelling, popular or non-literary syntax, or non-syntax, as well as vocabulary, furnishes rich material, rendering highly desirable the acquisition of this important work for all classical as well as theological libraries.

E. G. SIHLER.

CHRISTIANITY AND LIBERALISM³

The author of this book is assistant professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. The contents of the volume are the amplification of an address delivered before the Ruling Elders' Association of Chester Presbytery, and afterward published in *The Princeton Theological Review*.

In the Introduction the author states the purpose of the book to be a clear statement of the religious issue of the present day in order that the reader may be aided in deciding the issue for himself. "Presenting an issue sharply is indeed by no means a popular business at the present time; there are many

³ Christianity and Liberalism, by J. Gresham Machen, D.D. New York, 1923. Pp. 189.

who prefer to fight their intellectual battles in what Dr. Francis L. Patton has aptly called a 'condition of low visibility.' " Many are afraid a frank discussion may affect contributions to the mission boards or hinder consolidation or produce a poor showing in the columns of church statistics. This volume proceeds on the conviction that the truth should be told regardless of immediate consequences, confident that the ultimate outcome must be beneficial.

"In the sphere of religion, in particular, the present time is a time of conflict; the great redemptive religion which has always been known as Christianity is battling against a totally diverse type of religious belief, which is only the more destructive of the Christian faith because it makes use of traditional Christian terminology." Known as "modernism" or "liberalism," this non-redemptive religion is untrue to either label, for it comes of a hoary traditional line, and it is exceedingly narrow in its ignoring of many relevant facts. The manifold forms of this movement are all rooted in naturalism. The present-day emphasis on this rationalistic philosophy the author traces to the amazing advances made in the past hundred years in the material standards and conditions of life, with the attendant distrust of everything old. And so, in the realm of religion, the twentieth century is tempted to discard the first century as crude and elementary in its thinking. The problem, which is the most serious concern of the church today, is: "What is the relation between Christianity and modern culture: may Christianity be maintained in a scientific age?"

In arriving at an answer, the reader is reminded of the fact that material betterment has gone hand in hand with spiritual decline. "In the midst of all the material achievements of modern life, one may well ask the question whether in gaining the whole world we have not lost our own soul." Is there a lost secret of life? There is; and it is to be found in the Gospel of divine grace, almost forgotten in our day, "but destined to burst forth once more in God's good time, in a new Reformation, and bring light and freedom to mankind."

The volume deals first with the attitude of the widely prevalent naturalistic religion toward doctrine. "The reassuring employment of traditional phrases" with a totally different definition from that of the historic usage is deeply deplored, evidencing as it does a lack of frankness and a disposition to mislead the unwary. The modernist's scant regard for doctrine is not confined to the theologies which have been wrought out by the great constructive thinkers of the centuries since Christ, but extends also to the contents of the New Testament. Paul's fine tolerance towards the spirit in which the Gospel was being preached by some who were jealous of him and sought to add affliction to his bonds is contrasted in a strong passage with his rigid rejection of the corrupted gospel of rival preachers in Galatia. "Paul was far more interested in the content of the message than in the manner of its presentation." The well known attempt to separate between Paul and Jesus, and between the Jerusalem disciples and Jesus, is carefully analyzed and shown to be futile. The substance of all that the New Testament teaches is found after the critics have pared away every possible addition to the original transcription of the teachings of our Lord. The Sermon on the Mount is taken up and shown, "like all the rest of the New Testament to lead a man straight to the foot of the Cross." Ethical standards find their real creation and vitalization in the redemptive work of Christ.

In pleading for the proper regard for doctrine in the life of Christianity, the author makes it plain that he is not pleading for doctrine apart from life or for certain minor points about which good men disagree, such as the exact manner and program of our Lord's second coming, or the mode and efficacy of the sacraments, or the nature and prerogatives of the Christian ministry, or Calvinism as opposed to Arminianism, or even the differences between the Roman and the Protestant churches. Not that these things are unimportant, for they are; but they are not what might be called capital differences. They are not the substitution of another religion for Christian-

ity. However, "the chief modern rival of Christianity is 'liberalism.' An examination of the teachings of liberalism in comparison with those of Christianity will show that at every point the two movements are in direct opposition."

In the chapter on God and Man the radical differences between Christianity and liberalism on these two points are pointed out with clearness and force. The Christian emphasis on a personal God, transcendent yet immanent, the Father, not of all men indiscriminately, but of those who receive His Son as Saviour, is placed over against the pantheistic conception of liberalism with its vagueness of definition and its false empiricism. The loss of the consciousness of sin and the supreme confidence in human goodness is pointed out as characteristic of modernism's attitude towards man. "Seventy-five years ago Western civilization, despite inconsistencies, was still predominantly Christian; to-day it is predominantly pagan," for "paganism is optimistic with regard to unaided human nature, whereas Christianity is the religion of the broken heart."

In the chapter on the Bible insistence is found on the conformity of individual experience with the Scriptures. Without experience there can be no Christian life, but there can be no Christian experience, though there may be religious experience, unless that experience depends on the redeeming work of Christ. And it is just this redeeming work that is set out in the Scriptures.

Ably, eloquently, and with relentless logic the author pursues his course through chapters on Christ, Salvation, and The Church, showing, that before Christ is example, He is Redeemer; that He is Redeemer because on the cross He gave His life a ransom for many; and that His church is composed of those who have by faith entered into the fruits of that redeeming sacrifice. "God send us ministers who, instead of merely avoiding denial of the Cross, shall be on fire with the Cross." In pungent, practical suggestions the writer of this admirable book points the way for the church in this perilous hour. First, Christian men and women should encourage those

who are standing for the New Testament interpretation of Christianity as against a denatured Christianity; second, great care should be exercised in accepting candidates for the Christian ministry; third, churches should insist on having evangelical pastors first and foremost, men who will not obscure or deny the cardinal facts of Christianity; fourth, there should be a revival of Christian education, so that the average Christian may know what he believes and why he believes it. "Laymen, as well as ministers, should return, in these trying days, with new earnestness, to the study of the Word of God."

The whole book is written in fine spirit, with a clearness of argument and a simplicity of style that puts it easily within the comprehension of those who may not be familiar with the technical language of the schools. One could wish that every minister and every church officer and every professed follower of Christ might have this book and read it carefully.

H. H. McQUILKIN.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN LIFE AND BEHAVIOUR ⁴

As the title indicates, Dr. Bruce has set himself to the task of applying the principles of modern psychology to the special study of Christian life and behavior. In thus limiting the field, and in carrying his study into the sociological and economic realms, he has brought out the contribution which psychology is able to make to the understanding and application of Christianity in a way that is most suggestive.

When the psychologists began to study the phenomena of religious experience they were met with strong protests from those who insisted that religious experience is so manifestly divine that it is too sacred to be subjected to the prying curiosity of the human reason, and is beyond the scope of science. Therefore the psychologists were immediately put upon the defensive. This attitude naturally resulted in stressing the

⁴ The Psychology of Christian Life and Behaviour, by W. S. Bruce, D.D. Edinburgh, 1923. Pp. VIII+335.

psychological features of religious experience and passing over the religious elements. So that psychological study of religion became materialistic and humanistic. All objective religious reality was discredited.

In America, where this work has been carried on in our colleges and universities and where the results of this type of teaching have become well known through the writings of the leading psychologists, and where college boys and girls are the victims of this one-sided presentation of the subject, the religious specialists—preachers and teachers—have lost patience with psychologists, and have even refused to take the trouble to familiarize themselves with the subject. For this reason there exists a very wide gulf between the professors who teach psychology of religion and the preachers and teachers who are interested in religion but who do not know its psychology. Where this antagonism is sharp and the practical consequences of teaching this one-sided kind of psychology of religion are well known, it is inevitable that there should develop deep-seated prejudices on both sides. Psychologists do not understand the point of view of the preachers, and preachers do not understand the point of view of the psychologists. A third party generally makes the best peacemaker.

So it seems that in England and Scotland, where the actual ravages and hostilities of the war between psychology and religion are less felt, there is springing up a group of Christian thinkers who are undertaking the task of bringing together psychology and religion. The output of books upon this subject is very large. These peacemakers frankly acknowledge that America is the leader in the study of psychology of religion, and their books show that they have been diligently reading the writings of American psychologists. The remarkable fact is, that they are able to read this mass of literature with all of its anti-Christian trend and yet separate so readily the wheat from the chaff. They distinguish between the facts of psychology and the theories of the psychologists. And herein they show an open-mindedness of approach which

is going to mean much for the future of psychology and religion.

It is most remarkable to find a Christian scholar of the standing of Dr. W. S. Bruce, able to read Ames, Leuba, G. Stanley Hall, and others and select the invaluable psychological principles involved, but set aside the unsupported conclusions, and to do this with such a splendid spirit of fairness. It would be well for every American to read this informing book in order to learn how such an attitude is possible. The result of this attitude of mind toward psychology of religion is enabling the English and Scotch Christian thinkers to grapple with the problem of psychology of religion instead of leaving it all to the non-religious psychologists. The inevitable result of this devotion to the subject will be that in the next generation the leadership in the study of the psychology of religion will be transferred to the other side of the Atlantic, just because the Christian thinkers in America have allowed their prejudices to rob them of their legacy.

How sympathetically and thoroughly this appropriation of the principles of psychology to the service of Christianity can be carried on by one who has no sympathy whatever with many of the theories of the psychologists is well illustrated in this book by Dr. Bruce. In his twenty-five chapters, he touches upon almost every phase of the problem, and he makes an application of the principles of psychology to Christian life and behavior which is always constructive and helpful. As a compendium of the problem, the book is well worth reading. It presents the need for a better mastery of the principles of psychology of religion, a history of the science, a study of the psychology of childhood, adolescence, religious growth and conversion as a crisis, religious mass movements and revivals, the psychology of sainthood, prayer, mysticism, the value of the emotions in religion, suggestion and autosuggestion, the psychology of industry and industrial ideals, and the psychology of the future life, together with many other helpful subjects.

To the specialists in psychology it will not be entirely satisfactory, for Dr. Bruce possesses only an academic knowledge of the subject and does not follow his principles when he feels that they may lead him into dangerous territory. He assumes many things which psychology is not willing to concede. And then he leans too heavily upon some of the findings of the American psychologists which need revision. But these defects will not disturb any but the expert in psychology. To all readers the book will be found most helpful.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

CHRISTIAN WAYS OF SALVATION ⁵

The thoroughgoing evangelical believer finds difficulty in giving a safe and yet a fair estimate of Dr. Richards' book, *Christian Ways of Salvation*. The author says so many good things and true that one is often thrilled with admiration; then again he says so many erratic things that one can scarcely restrain one's patience. The trouble is, having departed from the true, full-toned, evangelical standard of faith and become decidedly liberalistic, Dr. Richards is not a consistent thinker, and so takes many impossible positions. That is what makes his work so difficult to handle and review.

Gladly do we note some points of excellence in the book. The author's constant emphasis on justification by faith and salvation by grace is most gratifying. His analysis and criticism of Humanism in all its forms, from the earliest time to the present, are keen, clean cut, and true. While we cannot underwrite all his criticisms of Luther and Zwingli, yet his presentation of their attitude toward the Bible and salvation by grace is correct and incisive. His out-and-out rejection of Socinianism in the Middle Ages and Unitarianism to-day meets with our most hearty approval. One cannot speak too

⁵ *Christian Ways of Salvation*, by George W. Richards, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa. New York, 1923. Pp. XIII + 332.

highly of the contrast he draws between Buddhism and Platonism on the one hand, and the Christian faith on the other, especially in these days when so many attempts are being made to blur and minimize the differences. So we might go through the book and cite many choice passages to which the evangelical Christian would subscribe with joy.

However, we regret to have to say that the book seems to us to have serious defects and inconsistencies. First, the title, which is arresting and may stir curiosity, does not seem to be happily chosen. How many "Christian ways of salvation" are there? To speak accurately, there is only one, namely, sincere faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. But this title gives the impression that there may be more than one way of salvation in the Christian system. Is it not a mistake to put ambiguity in the caption of a book?

Besides, evangelical Christians are not much given to pronouncing final judgment on people, or declaring just who will be saved and who will not be saved. That is a matter which they put into God's hands, for He alone is competent to give the final verdict. They simply desire to bear clear testimony as to what the Holy Scriptures teach, and then leave the errorist in the hands of God. Dr. Richards' subject seems to imply that there are various Christian ways of salvation, and his treatment often seems to convey the impression that the various ways of apprehending the Christian system exclude in each case the opponents from salvation itself. Therefore we think the title of his book both confusing and unfortunate.

Dr. Richards holds the theory of evolution, and in his first chapter tries to account for the origin of religion on that hypothesis. Indeed, there is no intimation of an original divine revelation, but religion began with man in a primeval state of savagery. Now, the Bible gives a very different account of the rise of religion, namely, that God created man in His own image and thereby endued him from the start with a religious nature. Is not that a far nobler and more inspiring view than the one which holds that God started man out with bestial rather than ethical and spiritual characteristics?

Note this sentence: "The first attempts to control material and spiritual forces for the amelioration of man's condition were made through magic, which operates mediately or immediately" (p. 22). The author surely knows that this is not the Biblical teaching. Therefore, on the hypothesis of evolution, he simply jettisons the early parts of the Bible. In fact, he never even refers to the Bible as the explanation of the genesis of religion. He has many objections to dogmatism among the theologians, but he dogmatizes regarding evolution as if it were all settled. Yet he constantly calls his view the evangelical one. He stands fast by Paul who taught salvation by grace through faith in Christ; yet Paul says: "As in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Paul goes back to Adam, created in the divine image. Richards harks back to a hairy animal just emerging into the initial stages of fetichism.

Again and again Dr. Richards counters the doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible. It seems, indeed, to be one of the special objects of his dislike. There must be some things in the Bible that are particularly offensive to his rationalistic spirit. Yet he says: "The glad tidings must always be found in the Scriptures. * * * Through the Scriptures and through the Church, the community of the saved and the saints, salvation is given unto the world" (p. 294). Again he says: "Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God" (p. 295). Is that consistent thinking? How can confident appeal be made to the Scriptures if they are rife with error?

Dr. Richards is opposed to dogma; yet his book has many categorical assertions, often without any attempt to establish them by reason, as, for example (p. 278), where he announces with almost papal finality just what "the essence of Christianity" is (p. 278).

Many times Dr. Richards intimates that Christianity must be made to correlate with the science and philosophy of the day; yet elsewhere he declares that our religious convictions "are independent of any specific view of the world, whether

mythological or scientific." This surely is not consistent, nor is the assertion true; it would certainly give religion a very tottering foundation and make faith a naive act instead of one based on fact and buttressed by reason. Observe the lack of logical thinking here: "The scientist must not turn theologian, and the theologian must not turn scientist. Each has his world, his way of knowledge, his method of operation. When each remains true to his task and to his sphere, the results of both will be readily harmonized" (p. 290f.). Then we would beg to know who is to do the harmonizing? Is this consequential thinking? We do not believe that religion and science should be set off into two different compartments of life. If science and religion cannot be harmonized even by the man of fair intelligence, then there is something wrong with one or the other or with both. If religion goes one way and science another, you cannot go with both of them.

Finally we are led in fairness to say that the book is an instructive one because it reveals to us the winding, laborious way by which a liberalist tries to make people believe that he is evangelical. Evidently he would like to shed the name "liberal" and capture the good, strong, perduring word "evangelical," which has been held by the true, full-toned conservatives since the days of the Reformation. The sturdy blows he delivers against Materialism, Humanism, and Unitarianism are worthy of all praise. His stand for justification by faith and salvation by grace is noble and inspiring. We can only wish that one who agrees on so many points with the plenary Christian faith might be won to its complete and soul-satisfying acceptance.

LEANDER S. KEYSER.

THE TRUTHS WE LIVE BY⁶

For keen analysis this book would be hard to excel. The author commands a terse, chaste, and polished style, though never ornate. He is happy in the choice of his words, the right

⁶ The Truths We Live By, by Jay William Hudson, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Missouri. New York, 1921. Pp. XII + 308.

word apparently coming to him just at the right time. There are no carelessly constructed sentences to mar the work as a literary production. Although the book deals with deep problems in a fundamental way, so that close thinking is required to follow the finely knit logical processes, yet one cannot say in truth that the work is "hard reading." Neither does the author use many words of a purely technical character. In many ways it is a noteworthy production and ought to do much good in the present time of general skepticism, of running to and fro to find a solid foundation on which to build life's faiths and hopes.

The gist of the book is this: "The truths we live by" are, that the world is a moral order or economy, and immortality, God, and freedom are necessary corollaries or constituents of such an order. In carrying out his reasoning processes the author is acute, searching, convincing. Perhaps the greatest use of the book is that it puts science in its proper place, giving it credit for the great work it has accomplished in the practical sphere, and yet rebuking it for its presumption in thinking that it can frame a world-view by merely scientific processes. In its own domain it is king, but as soon as it leaves its special domain and enters the field of philosophy, it goes limping and is found to be inadequate to account for the great moral and spiritual "truths we live by." The author holds that science has no monopoly of the reasoning processes; there are other necessary modes of reasoning that mere physical science knows not of. In these higher spheres the scientist turns out to be a sciolist. All this is said by our author without for one moment meaning to discredit science when it "sticks to its own last."

The strongest parts of the book are those which argue for a real moral order over against the materialistic and mechanistic views that so much of the science of the day has been trying to impose upon the world. The author declares that no scientist, whatever may be his theories and speculations, "lives by" the mechanistic view; he always acts like a moral being, and expects others to act in the same way. So

what is the use to entertain a speculative philosophy which you cannot "live by"? But a moral economy, our author contends with might and main, connotes the freedom of the human will. Here he is at his best. We advise all advocates of the deterministic view of the will to read his arguments for the libertarian view. Just such a dissertation is needed in these days of a psychology that thinks so much more of neurons than of truly physical processes and facts.

Our author recognizes the faults and difficulties of our present-day civilization, yet in closing his book he sounds a decidedly optimistic note. Men are beginning to hold higher ideas and ideals of the basic verities, truer conceptions of the moral order, religious truth, the ultimate and eternal purpose of life; better conceptions of the rights of the individual and his relation to the social order; better conceptions of what democracy really means and includes. For the reasons given we are most grateful for this book from an author who occupies an important chair in a great university. When deep thinkers, from the purely scientific and philosophical viewpoint, come to the conclusion that human life is worth while only when men recognize a moral and spiritual order, with God, freedom, and immortality as basic truths, this fact augurs a brighter day.

To say that the work is entirely beyond criticism, however, would be going too far. The Christian theologian wants something clearer on the doctrine of God than is herein given. One cannot be sure, when the author speaks of God as "the Totality of Things" and as "the Universal Life," that he does not, after all, hold to something like a pantheistic conception. At least, the idea of God as a personal, loving, interested, and redeeming God, such as is set forth in the Holy Scriptures, is not made as clear as it should be. A hazy idea of God does not make a very substantial "truth to live by." Moreover, if the doctrine of immortality is to be of real value and inspiration to the human family, it should be depicted in more determinate and ample terms than are here employed. The Christian theologian may also observe that the fundamental

verities so stoutly maintained in this book and proved by so labored a logical process, were all revealed in the Bible centuries ago with the utmost lucidity. To mention these verities is the proof of this statement: God, freedom, personal immortality, the world a moral order, and the vitally religious nature of man. Are not all these effectively set forth in the Book of books? Dr. Hudson's learned treatise is particularly important just now as a demonstration of the fact that science, reason, and philosophy at their highest and best altitudes lead up to and correlate with those great truths which the Christian religion has taught through all the years. An earthy science and a groundling philosophy cannot be made to agree with the Biblical revelation, but whenever they move up to a higher plane and into a purer atmosphere they grasp the hand of the Christian verities in cordial friendship and fellowship.

LEANDER S. KEYSER.

ARTICLES TO BE PUBLISHED SOON

Among papers that will appear in early issues of **THE BIBLICAL REVIEW** are these:

The God-Man, by Professor W. H. T. Dau, of Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis.

Why Did Christianity Survive the Persecutions? by Professor John Alfred Faulkner, of Drew Theological Seminary.

The Problem of the Fourth Gospel Again, by Professor A. T. Robertson, of the Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville.

The Form and Power of Christianity, by Professor George Stibitz, of Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio.

A Study in Galatians 2:15-21, by Rev. G. G. Warren, of Changsha, China.

The Book Reviews are assigned and prepared with exceptional care.

A postal card will bring a sample copy